DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 223 642 TM 820 688

AUTHOR	Jones, Earl
TITLE	1981-82 ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program: East Texas State University. Annual External Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION	Development Associates, Inc., San Francisco, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Department of Education, Washington, DC.; East Texas State Univ., Commerce.
PUB DATE	Sep 82
GRANT	605248 .
NOTE	63p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Annual Reports; *Bilingual Education Programs; Bilingual Students; *Bilingual Teachers; English (Second Language); Evaluation Methods; Higher Education; *Program Evaluation; Spanish Speaking; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Dallas Independent School District TX; *East Texas State University; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title VII; External Evaluation

ABSTRACT

The 1981-82 external evaluation of the East Texas State University Elementary Secondary Eduation Act (ESEA) Title VII Bilingual Program is presented. This educational training program is designed to assist the State through the provision of well-prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists to upgrade the teaching of Texas' bilingual students. Measurable objectives were stated for the project. This external evaluation, together with the reports from internal monitoring, were designed to assure appropriate provision of services and instruction to the participants. This report includes: approaches to the evaluation; program processes; students in the program; student perceptions of the services; perceptions of instruction; report summary; and references. Evaluator resume, project forms and Boletin example are contained in the appendices. (Author/PN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED223642

DEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES, INC.

MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNMENTAL CONSULTANTS

693 SUTTER STREET, THIRD FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102
415/ 776-0120

ANNUAL EXTERNAL EVALUATION REPORT
1981-1982 ESEA TITLE VII
BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

Dr. Earl Jones

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Earl Jones

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- ✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

September 1982

TM 820 688

ARLINGTON - 2924 COLUMBIA PIKE, ARLINGTON, VIRGINIA 22204 Cable Address: DAIVASH 703/979-0100
ALBUQUERQUE - P.O. BOX 2128, 125 SECOND STREET, NW, ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO 87101 505/243-3537
DENVER - 1649 DOWNING STREET, DENVER, COLORADO 80218 303/831-0303
PHILADELPHIA - 1423A ROLLING GLEN DRIVE, GLENOLDEN, PENNSYLVANIA 19061 215/485-7959
WASHINGTON, D.C. - P.O. BOX 28058, 1756 COLUMBIA ROAD, NW, 2ND FLOOR, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20009 202/387-2090

COLUMBIA - APARTADO AEREO 90260, BOGOTA, COLOMBIA, SOUTH AMERICA 256-8604
EL SALVADOR - APARTADO POSTAL 01-286, SAN SALVADOR, EL SALVADOR, CENTRAL AMERICA 503/22-5723
PHILIPPINES - 161 ROXAS BLVD., #304, BACLARAN, METRO MANILA, PHILIPPINES 011/63-2-828-73-46

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The external evaluation of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program necessarily entailed the collection of a great many data. Many University professors and administrators, Dallas Independent School District professionals, and participants in the training program provided information and statistical data. While the number of those assisting is to large to name them all, their help is sincerely appreciated.

Much of the burden of coordinating the collection of data and arranging for the monitoring of the work was shared by:

Dr. Amado Robledo, Title VII Director

and

Dr. Alonzo Sosa, Bilingual Education Coordinator

Their efforts on behalf of the study are deeply appreciated. Similarly, their faciliatation of access to the interviewees and to the other data sources helped make the evaluation possible.

The external evaluator interviewed many professors, administrators, students, community members, officials of the participating districts, and the advisory committee. Their cooperation was critical to the completion of the report.

* * * * *

This report was prepared under contract to East Texas State University with ESEA Title VII funding, Grant 605248, from the US Department of Education. Officials of East Texas State University and the participating districts assisted by providing or facilitating information. The data reported, however, and the conclusions drawn, do not necessarily represent the official positions of the districts, the University, or the US Department of Education. No official endorsement of them should be inferred.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS i

THE EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM 1

Program Objectives 2
Program Processes 3
Sites for Instruction 4

APPROACHES TO THE EVALUATION 6

Internal Evaluation 6
Schematum of the Project Evaluation Design 7
External Evaluation 8

Monitoring 9
Interviews and Conferences 9
Observations 10
Project Documentation 10
Student Perceptions Study 10

Limitations to the Evaluation 12

PROGRAM PROCESSES 14

Administration 15
Inter-Agency Cooperation 16
Teaching Faculty 18
Professionalization 20
Community Involvement 21
Communications 22
Resource Facilities 23
Summary of the Process Variables 24

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM 26

Program Participants 26

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SERVICES 30

General Perceptions 30
Overview of the Services 33

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INSTRUCTION 34

Program Design 35
Ratings of the Courses 37

REPORT SUMMARY 39

REFERENCES 41

APPENDIX A: Evaluator Resume 42

APPENDIX B: Project Forms 49

APPENDIX C: Boletín Example 56

LIST OF TABLES

1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1982 27

2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1982. 28

3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Population . . 28

4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1982. 29

5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Means on Degree Design. 31

6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of Student Perceptions of the Clinical Assistance/Liaison Services: 1979-1982. 32

7: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of Participant Perceptions of the Consultant Component: 1979-1982 33

8: Mean Ratings of the Subject Areas, Subjects, and Levels of the Reporting Participants in 1981-1982. 38

THE EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY PROGRAM

East Texas State University, in conjunction with the Dallas Independent School District and others in the North Texas area, and with funds from the US Department of Education and some especially designated monies from the Texas Education Agency, plus budgeted items from the University itself, established a bilingual education program six years ago and has operated it since that time. The primary purpose of this training program is to assist the State through the provision of well prepared teachers, administrators, and specialists to upgrade the teaching of Texas' bilingual students.

During the past several years, enormous gains have been registered in the provision of services to limited and non-English speaking pupils. Some students still do not receive the necessary services, however, because the shortage of qualified teachers still persists. Indeed, the statistics on the latter problem, an insufficienct number of teachers, have not changed in recent years due in part to the increases in the number of youngsters needing bilingual education and in part to the number of teachers that have left the profession each year or who take jobs in other states.

The State of Texas has a high proportion of Mexican Americans, other Spanish speaking populations, Native Americans, and recently, speakers of other languages, notably Vietnamese. Too, the emphasis on teaching English as a Second Language, both as a separate subject and in conjunction with bilingual education, increased the training needs for the North Texas area. The original anticipation, then, of a relatively short term training effort, was not borne out. While the number of Mexican Americans enrolled in universities has risen dramatically in Texas, the number training to be bilingual education teachers leveled off before the needs were met. Nearly no Vietnamese speakers are enrolled in teacher training programs in the State and few from other language groups expect to enter the field.

Several factors have contributed to the slow growth in the number of Spanish speaking teachers. Although most Mexican Americans are fluent in oral/aural Spanish, few of the older teachers and only recently some of the younger people, have had the opportunity to become fully literate in that language. Many high schools and most universities offered Spanish courses but since their thrust was conversation, few Mexican Americans enrolled. This lack reduced the pool of potential teachers from that group. Furthermore, as with all groups, only a limited number want to be teachers - they enroll in many different academic programs. Too, even those who choose education as a career, do not necessarily want to teach in elementary schools nor in bilingual education; many prefer to teach mathematics, science, and the other fields. As with speakers of any other language, individual inclinations vary widely.

Additionally, the salaries of teachers in Texas have not kept pace with those in many other fields and education's drawing power among Mexican Americans has decreased. Higher salaries elsewhere drain Texas resources. And, finally, there is a substantial proportion

of Mexican Americans that has not subscribed to bilingual education as a way to improve the education of their children. That, also, reduces the potential for Spanish/English bilingual education as a chosen teaching field.

The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education Program is a vital part of the necessary mobilization to meet the challenge. By providing not only the subject matter and education courses required, but additionally offering a strong program in the Spanish language, the University helps those already literate in the language, those who need only certain portions of it, or those who want to become fluent and literate. Further, with the population of Spanish speakers growing in the northern portion of the state, and with the economic status of many of them still low in comparison to some other groups, the tuition assistance part of the program has not diminished in importance. While Texas teacher salaries may not be very high, that field still serves as one avenue for upward mobility while at the same time providing teachers who can be trained for bilingual education duties and who, at the same time, understand the needs of the youngsters they serve. The earlier federal aim of furnishing seed monies for the establishment of university programs was commendable and has produced important results. The additional benefit, helping supply the training of bilingual teachers while at the same time assisting low income Mexican Americans and others to enter the education field, should not yet be abandoned. The need is still great. The continuing participation of the federal and state governments, the school districts, and the University is vital to improvements in education.

Program Objectives

The program at East Texas State University was designed to increase the effectiveness of teachers and administrators in meeting the needs of limited and non-English speaking pupils in the state, and especially in the northern part of the state. The programs at all three levels - undergraduate, masters, and doctorate - first offer a strong preparatory program in the several kinds of subject matter to be taught, in the methods for general education, in the specific methods for bilingual education, and in linguistics and the Spanish language. That is, the University is concerned that the participants, for example, know mathematics and how to teach mathematics in both English and Spanish. Bilingual and multicultural skills in counseling, administration, and other specializations are included. Expertise in working with parents and other community members of different cultures is an important part of the program.

Further, the program was designed to help educational personnel meet the educational needs and other life skills of all children, to develop the special expertise to provide equal opportunity of access to children of limited and non-English speaking proficiency, and to help improve their performance within the educational, social, and economic systems once they have gained entry. As a part of their education, the participants also experience bilingual education as they pursue their undergraduate and graduate degrees, thus increasing

their awareness of the strengths and weaknesses, the promises and problems, of learning in two languages. The courses, the bilingual environment, the utilization of the teachers' classroom experiences in the program, and frequent meetings and other developmental work with professionals in education and members of the communities, were expected to help create a climate conducive to reaching the goals of this program.

The program objectives were stated in behavioral terms, that is, the program was designed as competency based, to help the students acquire the knowledge and skills needed in:

- English and Spanish
- Mexican American and other cultures
- Bilingual teaching methodologies
- Measurement of student progress
- Research methodology

Special objectives related to counseling, administration, and other school functions were also stated. In brief, the objectives spoke to the acquisition, improvement, and knowledge of languages and how to impart them and subject matter to children; to add knowledge of the socioeconomic and cultural realities of the US cultures, especially Mexican American, and how these can affect children's learning; to increase teachers' and other personnel's knowledge and supplement their knowledge and skills in research so they can profit more from publications and might, themselves, contribute to the body of knowledge about Mexican Americans and bilingual education through research.*

Program Processes

East Texas State University incorporated a wide variety of academic resources into the program, utilizing the knowledge and expertise of many disciplines. English, Spanish, linguistics, history, sociology, anthropology, psychology, elementary education, and administration were the sources of input. This necessitated the cooperation of three colleges and several departments within the university, as well as the graduate division. The degree design and the course syllabi were carefully prepared with the advice of the bilingual education personnel of the Texas Education Agency, the Dallas Independent School District and others nearby, and representatives of the potential students, as well as of the communities they were to serve. Further modifications have been made as each successive year's experiences were evaluated. New courses have been added as the need arose and others have been modified. (See the 1976-1977 through the 1980-1981 reports for the sequence of the changes.)

Many courses have been offered at the school sites from which the participants came, helping to increase the reality based nature of the program. Field experiences were also provided for students not currently teaching in bilingual education. Resource persons from the Mexican American community, both general citizens and a number

---

* *See original application to the US Office of Education and the continuation proposals to the US Department of Education.*

of professionals, were brought into the planning process. East Texas State University staff members with skills and experience in related fields were utilized. Staff vacancies were often filled with qualified Latin Americans and others who spoke Spanish and/or have had experience in bilingual education; these, too, were added to the consulting pool for the implementation of the program. The library has carried out a continual acquisition process of the needed materials for the research and course work.

An essential ingredient in the plan was the participation of the bilingual teachers in the presentations in the classes, whether brought in as special resources or included as participants in the degree or certificate programs. The knowledge and skills they had gained, the materials they were using, and their general experiences added a substantial dimension of practicality to the training efforts. This was especially important for the methods and materials courses offered by elementary education. Further, it was expected that the requirements of the courses, the materials they would develop in education, language, and culture classes, as well as materials they would discover via the program generally, would add importantly to the conduct of bilingual and multicultural education in the schools.

Just as important, too, was the use of the Spanish language in the courses by both the professionals and the students. While there were some limitations to the oral/aural capabilities with Spanish in both groups, each would be expected to strive for a continual increase in the amount of Spanish in the lectures, discussions, and written work in order to provide some of the bilingual environment and furnish opportunities for the acquisition of a professional grasp of the language. The University chose professors with the greatest command of Spanish while at the same time being specialists in their fields.

Liaison services were also included in the process. Faculty with appointments that allowed monitoring of classes in which bilingual education was being conducted, assisting school staffs, and consulting with the student participants, were chosen as the primary personnel for this assignment. Additionally, the liaison personnel gathered information from the schools which was then fed back into the program, thereby aiding the University in keeping itself current and effective.

Sites for Instruction

In keeping with its philosophy of taking the education to the most appropriate setting, several instructional areas have been utilized. The campus of East Texas State University, with its library holdings and professionals available, hosts a substantial number of courses. Similarly, the University Satellite Learning Center in Dallas, with specialized literature references and personnel, is important to the effort. Courses are also held in differing schools in the Dallas Independent School District, and when appropriate, to buildings in other districts. The multiple facilities allow for the greatest facilitation for full time teachers and administrators, and at the same time ensures the practicality of research resources, classroom access

for demonstrations, and the maximum transferability to the students who are campus based. While most of the campus courses for graduate students were taken during the summer sessions, some students were able to take evening courses at the University and increase their professional contacts.

The classes offered in the schools of the several districts have facilitated work with the community organizations, especially those that were Mexican American, since the students were, in fact, in the community. The arrangement also made it possible for a greater exchange of information with bilingual education personnel, principals, and others interested in the teaching of limited and non-English speaking pupils.

The East Texas State University Satellite Learning Center, with its expanded facilities for the library and for the staff, continued as an important resource for the faculty, district personnel, and the students. The extension of the ERIC and Lockheed search terminals to the center improved student and staff research capabilities.

The problems of small school districts are often quite different from those as large as Dallas or Fort Worth. The inclusion of more of these in the program has materially aided the provision of technical assistance to the districts, their bilingual and English as a Second Language programs, and the general interaction between the faculty and staffs of the schools, a mutually beneficial communications network for the districts and for the University.

APPROACHES TO THE EVALUATION

Three separate approaches were utilized in the evaluation of the East Texas State University Title VII Bilingual Education Program: internal, external formative, and external summative. The first, internal, had two sources - the regular University evaluation activities and the monitoring of all work by the administration of the Title VII project. The second, formative by an external evaluator, was accomplished through an exit interview and an interim written report at the conclusion of each external monitoring. The third, summative by an external evaluator, was primarily composed of the presentation of the data and conclusions through the annual report.

Internal Evaluation

East Texas State University maintained strict accounting of student enrollment, fiscal management, and faculty preparation for teaching the courses. The University was thus the most efficient source of information on these areas and it furnished reports on them to the funding source through its regular channels.

The supervisory functions of the deans of the colleges and of the heads of departments, added further dimensions to the management of the project. University wide committees on curricula, courses, and degrees contributed to the development of quality in the program. Faculty committees for the students seeking the undergraduate and graduate degrees, unique to each student or handled by an advisor, maintained an individual completion and quality control, as well as contributing to the students' development in the profession. The Academic Vice President was directly charged with the supervision of all teaching/learning programs, thus involving the central administration in the evaluation function.

Special advisory committees to the bilingual teacher training project also were constituted, including members from appropriate university entities, the Dallas Independent School District, students, and the community. These committees' functions in planning, assessment, and revision of the program helped assure that the objectives were reached.

The project staff also used a wide variety of consultants to aid in the several phases of the program. Representatives from the regional education service centers, the Texas Education Agency, community organizations, faculty from other universities, and the US Department of Education, added further depth to the evaluation. The continuous input, through the liaison personnel, from the aides, teachers, and administrators of the several schools and districts from which they came, also gave an internal formative evaluation dimension difficult to achieve in most university programs. The liaisons completed a standard form after each monitoring or assistance visits to the schools, with the district administration, and when participating in community activities. (See the form in Appendix B.) The information from these was integrated into the internal project reports at mid

SCHEMATUM OF THE PROJECT EVALUATION DESIGN

Internal	
Sources:	**Monitoring:**
University Departments, Colleges, Central Administration	Supervision of faculty and students, schedules, programs, and syllabi
Coordinator, Bilingual Education	Academic advising and review of student progress
Director, Title VII ESEA Project	General management and fiscal control of project resources
External Evaluator	Feedback from monitoring
External	
US Department of Education	Supervision of programmatic and fiscal elements
Dallas Independent School District and other participating districts	Recommendations on participants and programmatic aspects; feedback on student progress as they teach
Texas Education Agency	General supervision of the certification program and course offerings
External Evaluator	Monitoring of all activities through observations, interviews, and document reviews; evidenced in interim and final reports and conferences

year and at the conclusion of the year, thus they were not included in this external report. Further, the information from the other internal evaluation activities were embodied in the project's reports and likewise were excluded from the present study.

External Evaluation

In 1976, East Texas State University contracted with a private firm, Development Associates with headquarters in Arlington, Virginia, and a branch office in San Antonio, Texas, to perform the external evaluation. The company has conducted many local, regional, and national surveys, needs assessments, and evaluation studies in the field of bilingual education. The agreement called for both formative and summative evaluation for the year 1976-1977.

Dr. Earl Jones, senior associate and bilingual education specialist, was assigned the major research tasks connected with the contract. His experience in bilingual education in Texas and Paraguay, and later in California and Guatemala, his proficiency in English and Spanish, his teaching, research, and administrative roles in schools and universities, together with his service in evaluating a large number of Title VII and other bilingual programs, gave him the wide perspective necessary for this project evaluation. (A curriculum vitae is included in Appendix A.)

The contract was renewed during the second year, 1977-1978. When Development Associates closed its Texas office, an agreement was reached whereby Dr. Jones would continue the external evaluation with the East Texas State University program as an independent affiliate with Development Associates. Subsequently, Dr. Jones was transferred to the San Francisco, California, office of the company as director of the Study of California Services to Limited and non-English Speaking Students, funded by the California Legislature. The independent affiliate relationship was maintained for the East Texas State University contract and the later formative and summative activities were conducted under that arrangement.

The funding for the formative and summative evaluation has always been severely limited. To maximize the utility of the activities, therefore, the agreement called for the following tasks, each to serve both functions:

- Monitor the graduate classes offered.
- Survey sample bilingual education classes taught by the participating students.
- Seek information on the conduct of the program from both district and University officials.
- Study the documents related to the project or emanating from it.
- Confer with the project personnel and teaching faculty on the implementation of the project.

Recommendations were to be made to the project staff after each task, providing formative information for the improvement of the program. Two monitoring schedules were provided and conducted, and both oral

and written interim reports were submitted to the director of the project. Summaries of the findings were incorporated, when pertinent, within this annual report. Some actions taken by the personnel or the University were also reported when they impacted directly on the conduct of the program.

As a result of the first evaluation tasks in 1977, including a study of the project documents and conferences with personnel, a more precise investigation into the students' perceptions of the program was recommended. The agreement was modified to include this facet. The instruments were then derived cooperatively by the evaluator, the project director, and the faculty advisory committee. The questionnaires were administered, the data analyzed, and the results reported in each of the annual reports and interimly to the director. (Details on the instruments and the data analyses are described in later sections and the instruments are displayed in Appendix C.)

Monitoring

Funding permitted two sets of monitoring, one conducted early each project year and another later on. In 1981-1982, the monitorings were carried out in December and in June. Regular class conduct was monitored during alternate observations of lecture, discussion, and other activities on both the home campus and at the Dallas site. Alternating the sessions allowed for sampling of each kind of activity utilized in the class instruction while covering more of the classes in operation on the days of the monitoring. Four courses were studied in December and six others in the early June period. Students' work was also examined and interviews with students and professors were conducted at that same time to maximize the short time available.

Additionally, a number of other activities of the project were monitored during the two periods: two special seminars by outside consultants, dinner and breakfast meetings of the students and faculty, a meeting of the project personnel with the Spanish professors, and a general student meeting. Information gleaned from those activities aided in providing useful input for the future of the program as well as gathering summative data.

Interviews and Conferences

An important part of the evaluation function was to interview the participants in the various activities. During each monitoring, interviews were held with the students, professors, community members, administrators, and others involved in the work. These supplied information for the formative and summative evaluations but they were particularly useful in furnishing the explanations of the events that were observed. In addition, in the case of the students, the interviews gave an opportunity to assess their progress in Spanish, English, and the subject matter fields.

The project personnel facilitated appointments with the officials

primarily charged with the implementation of the program, both in the University and the districts. The latter were seen only briefly in 1981-1982 due to pressing schedules. Questions to probe their commitment to the quality and continuation of the project were asked. Complete candor was apparently granted, sharing both the problems and the successes with the interviewer. Summary information obtained from the interviews and conferences was included in the appropriate sections of this report.

Observations of Students' Classes

A variety of classrooms taught by the students of the project was observed, principally to assess the needs of the academic program rather than evaluate, per se, those classes, although disparities between the needs and the realizations contributed to the external assessment of the effects of the program. Information from those visits was used to make both interim recommendations to the project and to formulate long term impact conclusions for the University and the districts.

Project Documentation

The project proposal and its subsequent negotiated modifications, the interim reports by the project personnel, and the continuation documents, submitted to the US Department of Education, were provided for examination. Resource materials, research and class papers by students, correspondence with several agencies, and the project newsletter, *Boletín*, were also reviewed. Of special interest, as evidence of institutionalization, was the correspondence with pertinent administrators of the University, proposing and providing resources for the incorporation of the project as a regular University component. Evidence of faculty and student participation in professional activities was also furnished.

The Student Perceptions Study

As noted previously, an examination of the internal evaluation plans and efforts, in addition to a review of the external evaluation agreement, showed that a gap in the design was that of the students' perceptions about the program and its components. A study of these was proposed and the draft questionnaires and opinionnaires were devised, reviewed by the project personnel and faculty, and the final versions prepared. These were first administered in spring 1977 and have been a continual feature of the evaluation since that time.

The study was set up to provide interim data, via student opinions, on the conduct of courses, progress in Spanish, content or methods courses given and needed, suggestions for improving the program, and ratings of their degree design. Additionally, the instruments were prepared so they could be coded and analyzed through computer services. The analyses were performed at the computer center at Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, the first two years and in a

compatible program at San Francisco (California) State University since that time. (The coding and analysis setup were detailed in the 1976-1977 report and are not repeated herein.) Versions 6, 8, and 9 of the *Statistical Package for the Social Sciences* (Nie et al) were used. No names were used on the instruments but the students were asked to provide their social security numbers; when these were included, longitudinal tracking of changes in their perceptions was performed. Overall longitudinal studies, including all students, were also done.

The instrumentation comprised three separate forms. The first primarily sought certain biographical/demographic data to be used as possible differentiating variables for analyzing the long term results. Students were also asked to rate their proficiency in oral/aural and reading Spanish when they began the program. That rating on Form A, supplied the basis for subsequent analyses of progress in that language. Form B requested suggestions for improving the program and the individual courses, and obtained an update on their Spanish proficiency. The opinionnaire, Form C, in keeping with the general University policy of student evaluation of courses, gave the opportunity for rating the several design and conduct aspects of the courses, an overall rating on each, and estimates of the amount of Spanish used by the students and the professors in the courses. (All three forms are included in Appendix C.)

During the first year, the questionnaires were handed out during one of the last class periods with an explanation of the purpose. The students were urged to participate. The professor then left the room and those students who wished to complete an instrument, voluntarily, did so, handed them to a student who sealed them into a stamped envelope and mailed the package directly to the evaluator. Assurance was given that neither the project staff nor the professor would see the completed instruments. Students were allowed to submit evaluations without including their social security numbers if they wished. Slightly more than 10% of them has left this blank across the years.

The voluntary participation was disappointing in some classes, totalling about 20% in one case and rising to about 80% in others. The student monitor had been provided a list of the students and was asked to note those that had completed a questionnaire. Because of the relatively low rate of return, it was subsequently decided that the list might have been a deterrent to responding; it was thereafter dropped. The response rate for the following quarter then rose dramatically. Again, however, the rate decreased to its lowest level in the next quarter. Consequently, students were also given the opportunity to mail the questionnaire themselves. Professors were also reminded to distribute the forms since interviews showed that some had neglected to do so. An increase was then experienced but the return rates have varied considerably across the years since then.

In 1980-1981, 135 sets of course evaluations were received by the external evaluator. In 1981-1982, the quantity grew to 147 sets, the largest since the evaluation began.

As will be seen in the tables reporting the results of the analyses, the N sizes were small for some courses and some sessions. In some courses, the number of students was quite small, especially those related to research and the individual projects, appropriate to the nature of that type of work. Absenteeism no doubt also accounted for some of the losses. The voluntary aspect also reduced the number sent in. Because of these circumstances, there was no necessary relationship between the number of respondents listed in the tables of this report and the enrollment in the courses. The small numbers weakened this portion of the study but could not have been avoided without prejudicing the rights of privacy of the students.

To ascertain whether the low response rate for some courses biased the calculated replies, an examination of them was conducted. The study showed that excluding those with only one or two forms, no necessary relationship existed between the number of respondents and the ratings; that is, students submitted instruments with low, medium, and high ratings in all but four courses. In those, no *weak* or *very weak* ratings were checked and only four *fair* replies were registered for all of the different course components. In two of the four only *strong* and *very strong* ratings were given. In other courses, however, and often involving the same students, some very low ratings were assigned. Interviews with some students were also conducted to examine the possibilities of biases and no direct relationships appeared. Some students who did not submit evaluations stated they simply did not do so; their stated ratings would have included the complete range of ratings offered. It is believed, therefore, that no substantial bias entered the ratings when three or more students completed the forms.

The instruments, as received via the mail by the evaluator, were then coded and keypunched for statistical analysis. The codings were 100% verified, the analyses performed, and the appropriate tables for the report were prepared. The computer cards for all the years to date were subsequently committed to magnetic tape for use in future longitudinal analyses.

Two kinds of data were transmitted to the project. The general information included in the tables in this report, plus the discussions with the director, was the first and most important to the formative evaluation. Professors were given the opportunity to request private data on their individual courses but only two did so. This annual report, including some analyses across the six years, was also to be tendered to the project director for the use of the University, the Bilingual Education Program, and the US Department of Education. The specific course designations are not disclosed within this report to protect the instructors.

Limitations to the Evaluation

Despite the several sources of information and the broad coverage of the design, one obvious weakness remained without investigation: the impact of the program on improving the teaching abilities of the students such that their pupils learned more. Stated more succinctly,

as a question, did the children in the classrooms of the students learn more because their teachers were participating in this project and degree program? The difficulties of such measurement are myriad and even controversial. The subject should not be avoided, however, simply because measurement is difficult and because the project lacked the funds and other resources to carry out such a study. Serious thought to providing at least some tentative conclusions should be given and some resources should be provided by the US Department of Education or other entities to conduct this important research.

Finally, the funding provided for external evaluation was small and the investigations, therefore, were necessarily brief, even in some cases cursory. The report must be taken within that limitation. Despite this handicap, a great deal of useful information was furnished throughout the study and that information helped the University and the project improve the program and its services. The external evaluator knows of no events or processes that were not scrutinized and therefore submits this report with confidence in the findings unless otherwise stated.

PROGRAM PROCESSES

East Texas State University has operated the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program for six years. In the first year, development occupied a large part of the administrative time and the program was begun at a highly functional rate. Several important changes were made during the year to strengthen both the participant benefits and the management capability so that still further improvements could be made in the future.

During the second year, the major processes were associated with the consolidation of management, enhancing the resources and services available to the participants and faculty, and the extension of the work to include a larger number of agencies and community institutions. The early cooperation with the Dallas Independent School District was continued and the McKinley Independent School District was added. East Texas State University membership in the Federation Bilingual Training Resource Center increased the resources available to the Title VII program and in return, the University contributed experience based knowledge to the management of the Federation operations. An augmented thrust the second year was the strengthening of the work with the Mexican American community, especially in the principal target area, Dallas, both by including that segment of the population in the management aspects of the program and in providing leadership enhancement services to its members.

In the third year, with the processes then principally at a routine level, the program further consolidated its service offerings and management systems, continued its work with the North Texas Federation and the community, and expanded its service area into new districts: Diocese of Dallas, Irving, Garland, Plano, Ennis, Mesquite, Mt. Pleasant, Paris, Tulia, and New Braunfels. Students were drawn from an even larger area while the participation from Dallas was increased. From the beginning, relations with the Texas Education Agency, the educational service centers, and other universities in the area were improved. One new element in the program was meetings with Native American groups to explore ways to serve that community component. Another addition was that of offering courses in Teaching English as a Second Language in conjunction with the Texas Education Agency. This was a valuable adjunct to the program and of inestimable assistance to the districts since little training in that field had been available previously.

The fourth year showed further consolidation and expansion of the program. The courses were updated and additional materials were included as they became available. Permission to grant a doctorate was sought and granted, and the federal funds for a few scholarships for that level were obtained. Specialist programs beyond the masters degree were also inaugurated. The number of undergraduate students was increased and the masters program continued to grow. Beginning efforts to provide assistance to other language groups, notably Vietnamese, were studied. The University/Texas Education Agency offerings in Teaching English as a Second Language were continued. Funds for the leadership development work with the Mexican American and

other community constituencies were not granted for this year but a part of that loss was taken up by student participants that carried out the work voluntarily. The North Texas Federation service activities were also discontinued; the several universities encomposed a part of the work within their regular programs but the loss of the considerable resources was significant.

During the fifth project year, East Texas State University was able to increase the participating students even though many colleges were experiencing substantial decreases. Further, more and more students were being attracted to the program from other parts of the state, from other areas of the US, and from Mexico. A bilingual science educator was added to the faculty. Management changes were needed, also, to relieve the enormous burden that was shouldered by the two administrators and the University was able to modify its staffing to improve the condition. The library continued its acquisitions and the Satellite Learning Center obtained a much larger holding of bilingual reference materials, as well as provide more space for the staff.

The sixth program year gave more emphasis to the undergraduate instead of the graduate levels; the undergraduates enrolled in greater numbers and there was some decrease in graduates. An endorsement plan to add English as a Second Language to the teaching certificate was approved and begun in operation. Several changes in the upper echelon of University administration were made and the new officers were oriented to the bilingual program.

Administration

A major strength of the East Texas State University Title VII program was the dedicated early leadership of the director and assistant director. Their experience through the first four years allowed a careful transition from a beginning effort to one that operated with professional expertise. Their incorporation into the regular University faculty furthered the program institutionalization and improvement.

The administrators had, in addition to the Title VII program duties, many regular faculty obligations. Recognizing the inequities in the demands on their time, the University reorganized some of the activities, separating the directorship of the Title VII program from the coordination of the general bilingual instructional efforts, creating two different positions. That organization continued during the sixth year and the separation allowed each to devote more time to the specifics of the assigned responsibilities.

The cooperation among the project, the departments, and the colleges not only continued but was increased, even though some of the persons occupying the administrative positions changed. A part of that continuance was the addition of personnel that knew about and supported bilingual education. The administration helped provide an environment in which the project could flourish. The Title VII program was seen as an integral part of the University.

The project director and bilingual program coordinator occupied new quarters early in the year that greatly enhanced the space and made communications with the departments in the College of Education much more complete. The capability of handling student affairs more privately was a major advantage of the new offices.

Changes in state laws and regulations necessitated their study and sometimes their incorporation into the teaching or management within the program. Often these resulted in increased contacts with districts and communications with new ones. In the long run, the additional work involved has benefitted the program. Amendments to the legislation governing the ESEA Title VII projects or impinging upon them were enacted or are under consideration. They naturally entail preparation by the project staff so that whether affecting districts or the University, they can be incorporated with a minimum of distraction from the primary function, that of preparing highly qualified teachers, administrators, and specialist staff members. The project paid close attention to the proposed changes and managed them well when they were enacted into law.

Inter-Agency Cooperation

The University Title VII program cooperated fully with the Federation Training Resource Center during its existence. The University continued to cooperate with the North Texas universities in all matters of interest to bilingual education. Similarly, the University personnel aided with many activities of the Mexican American community, both to help in the development of the community and as an expression of its support. The *Cinco de Mayo* and National Hispanic Week activities were enhanced by the participation of the faculty members.

In addition, and as a part of its own community, the program cooperated with the campus organization, *Asociación Cultural de Hispanos Americanos*, in helping publicize the organization and its activities. This was a natural extension of the program since it enhanced the academic input through assistance from members of that organization.

As previously noted, the program was considering how it could assist bilingual Vietnamese/English education. Native Americans, too, met with University and program officials for ways to improve the education for that group. Some assistance to German and Czech speaking groups was given.

Also discussed in another section, the program cooperated with the Texas Education Agency in offering specific training in the Teaching of English as a Second Language. Rapidly increasing in importance, this training represented an advance in the work of the University. Further, bilingual education students in other universities in North Texas participated in the courses with full transfer rights to their degree programs. Such cooperation helped augment the resources of each one when not enough students for courses in every university were warranted. Program help was also given to the Texas Association for Bilingual Education.

Institutionalization

East Texas State University continued to support the ESEA Title VII program and to incorporate it directly into the regular structure of the University. The previously noted office space and division of administrative responsibilities are cases in point. In addition, special evidence of institutionalization was demonstrated in:

- All the teaching positions were held by tenure track staff except one and discussions for resolving that remaining problem were underway;
- The undergraduate and graduate endorsement requirements for teaching English as a Second Language were proposed by the faculty and approved by the Texas Education Agency;
- All other certificate and degree programs were formalized and appeared in the undergraduate and graduate catalogs;
- Library holdings in bilingual education and related fields were substantially expanded on the home campus and the Satellite Learning Center.

The faculty strength in delivering a part of the instruction in that language remained at a high level, not only in the bilingual education staff but also in several other departments that contribute to the instruction.

The bilingual education coordinator and the external evaluator met with the new President of the University shortly after he assumed his duties to present an overview of the previous years of work, the results of the evaluations, and the strengths and areas needing improvement. The Dean of the College of Education continued in strong support of the program. The new Graduate Dean and the new Academic Vice President had already worked with the bilingual education faculty and their continuing support was assured.

All of the interviews with the University officials produced expressions of their concerns and commitment. The desire to fully incorporate the program completely into the University structure remained undiminished, even though the full realization of that aim could not be totally accomplished. The University has, however, institutionalized the ESEA Title VII program into its regular structure more than any other known by the evaluator.

The evaluator would like to emphasize the importance of this aspect of the East Texas State University approach to the Title VII project since he also works with other university training programs. It has been relatively easy for some universities to grant special status to a federal program, exempting it from the usual control and administrative mechanisms. The projects have almost always suffered later. Cessation of the grant, difficulties with degrees and/or credits, permanent faculty appointment omissions, and similar problems have often resulted in the disappearance or substantial reduction in the university offerings and services. While obviously East Texas State University needed federal support - six years was a relatively short time to implement a program that was a new field - and especially when the increased demands for bilingual teachers were still evident, there was undeniable evidence of the incorporation of this program into the regular offerings and structure of East Texas State University. It was a clear case of federal monies well invested for the future. Additionally, the low income level of many of the participants justified the aid from tuition assistance.

Teaching Faculty

The University and the project continued to make important moves in improving the capability to deliver bilingual teacher training. In addition to the appointments cited in previous reports, several departments have added faculty with demonstrated ability to work in bilingual education and the necessary related fields. The University has an unusual strength in that field and in teaching English as a Second Language.

The University was also able to reduce its dependence upon adjunct faculty. Such faculty members, even when chosen with a great deal of care, do not always produce the highest amount of student learning. Consequently, the additional strength within the University faculty was particularly laudable.

The University faculty was observed to work hard in making the program a success, closely following the degree design specified for bilingual education. The students perceived some weaknesses and those are detailed in a later chapter. Some part of the weakness was due to the field itself - the relatively small amount of objective research relating implementation to student performance. Some progress was noted in this regard: the study for the California Legislature; a series of articles in the *Reading Teacher* and the *AERA Journal*; plus evaluations of small projects described in the ERIC entries. The faculty was aware of the new materials and were incorporating them into their instruction.

Another source of the complaints voiced in the interviews was the many non-program courses taken by the undergraduate students, who were in the majority in 1981-1982. Students criticized poor preparation for some classes, dwelling on inconsequential material, and in a few cases, insufficient attention to their needs. While no university condones these problems, the number of complaints was probably no greater than had the students of other programs been queried.

Most importantly to the long term view of the teaching, the number and severity of the complaints about the quality of instruction in the graduate courses decreased markedly. The renovation of the syllabi and the last year's coordination of material across courses had largely eliminated the source of some graduate criticism.

Unfortunately, one area remained problemmatic for the undergraduates, that of the Spanish instruction. It must be noted, however, that some improvement in the ratings occurred, chiefly because one professor not previously included, was judged by the students to instruct well. The complaints registered in previous years about the denigration of Mexican American Spanish and about courses taught mostly in English, continued for two of the professors. The matter was again brought to the attention of the administration and reviews were promised. It must be emphasized that the graduate courses in Spanish were rated very high and almost no comments resulted.

The discussion of these problems is necessary but it should not be taken as a condemnation of the teaching within the program. To the contrary, the student ratings of the courses and the observed content coverage and teaching methods showed exemplary professor capabilities in most of them. "Tough but thorough" was a typical explanation for a professor that from the beginning has always had high ratings. "Demands a lot of work but teaches well," "knows bilingual education techniques and shows us how they should be conducted," and "it wasn't an English course but my writing improved because he demanded it" were other important responses. "I learned research in that course that wasn't even on research" was a complement any professor should be happy to merit. In summary, then, the majority of the professors in the program taught what they should and did it well. No program could ask for more - except to insist that all professors do that.

The amount of Spanish used in the classes has not increased much over the years. In some classes, 99% was conducted in that language; in others, nearly none. Several factors contributed to the differences. In some classes, there were so many monolingual English speakers that the professor would have been in error if he had conducted the classes in Spanish. Some professors, of course, did not speak fluent Spanish but most of these at least tried to use what they knew. One important technique observed in one course was that the professor, limited in Spanish, provided the necessary vocabulary for the content by writing the words on the board and obtaining help from Spanish speaking students in explaining them. Still another, who understood a great deal of Spanish but could not speak well, insisted that the Spanish speaking members of the class respond in Spanish. That, too, was a perfectly acceptable technique. In general, then, and considering the several factors, the amount of Spanish utilized in the courses was probably at about the level it could be. If the enrollment were higher, special Spanish sections could be formed but under the present circumstances, the various efforts to use that language were commendable.

The evaluator has had many opportunities to become well acquainted with some of the students who, because of necessary part time work, still remain. Two areas of improvement in oral Spanish have been noted in them: they used Spanish more and they made fewer errors. The increased vocabulary of the Spanish speaking Mexican Americans was notable. Vocabulary and pronunciation by the non-Mexican/Latin Americans improved. Students were also producing more project work in Spanish and that work was more accurate. Spelling improved, more diacritical marks were included, and the grammatical construction showed a better grasp of the language. An examination of some elementary teaching projects, for example, revealed few errors and even fewer clumsy phrasings. The writing in Spanish definitely increased and improved.

The general teaching practices of the faculty also improved. Only one professor was reported late or absent without warning; few students said a professor had come to class unprepared. The observed instruction showed preparation and dominance of the subject matter. While it may seem to an outsider that these would be expected in university

work, the reality in many university courses is less than desirable performance. East Texas State University definitely improved its teaching in the classes associated with the bilingual education program.

Not content with the present status in teaching, the project has continued its faculty development program with even more attention to instruction. Several seminars were held, both on the content of bilingual education and related topics, as well as on the methodologies for delivering them. Too, the University produced a student evaluation of the instruction and it was instituted during this year. While some professors were dissatisfied with the new system, the institutional pressure to improve instruction remained strong, as evidenced by the adoption of the evaluation.

Professionalization

The intensive duties of the staff in combination with the work in the project and in regular departmental functions demonstrated an unusual commitment. It also restricted some activities that might lead to greater professionalization. Nevertheless, the faculty members found time to work on some research, consult with other universities and some districts, and conduct evaluations. The faculty continued to show its concern for professional development.

In the process of adopting a certificate endorsement for English as a Second Language, the Texas Education Agency requested input from several sources. The project staff participated in one held by universities with bilingual education departments, presenting a provisional plan for a degree and for a certificate. The State evolved a tentative set of courses and East Texas State University was one of those asked to provide suggestions on it. Additionally, a special English as a Second Language subcommittee of the bilingual education committee drafted a proposed plan for East Texas State University and it was accepted almost in its entirety, making it possible for some students to begin work on the endorsement almost immediately.

The faculty persisted in its work with the Texas Association for Bilingual Education, the TESOL group, and the Association of Teachers of Foreign Languages. Even though no funds were available for some meetings, faculty members paid their own way to participate.

A strong interest in professional reading was manifested in several faculty contacts. Some cited recent articles and research reports, commented on evaluations and new measurement procedures, and in other ways demonstrated a good grasp of what was new in bilingual education. Faculty use of the two data retrieval systems was evidenced. The use of the many bilingual materials housed in the curriculum library, the main library, and the Satellite Learning Center was high. The library continued to respond to student and faculty needs by increasing the holdings. A notable production was an annotated bibliography on bilingual legislation and court cases produced by one of the librarians.

The project news organ, *Boletín*, also serves as an important communications effort, and in a very wide context: students, professors, teachers, and administrators. The presentation of materials about new legislation, recent research, and views about bilingual education help a great deal in keeping the audiences uptodate on vital topics. Summaries of locally produced surveys, graduate research, and evaluations underway furnish additional information.

Articles in area newspapers, radio and television programs, and direct letter communications were also maintained high in 1981-1982. These were seen as of increased importance since the restricted funds for the news organ reduced the number of issues. The campus newspaper aided materially in keeping the students and faculty informed. Each increases professionalization of the audiences.

Graduate student research, produced primarily in partial fulfillment of the requirements in the research methods course, continued to show improvement. The publications search, treatment of the materials, and clear distinction between the reporting and conclusions sections, were major advances. Although sometimes seen as a minor aspect of such work at the masters level, the excellent mechanical preparation added much to the professional appearance of the papers. The faculty members and the students are to be congratulated on the quality of the work. And the added benefits of publication and presentation at conferences, thereby imparting the knowledge to others, further demonstrated the degree of importance held by the project regarding professionalization.

Community Involvement

Although Title VII no longer funded the direct community involvement activities of the bilingual program at East Texas State University, the previous work was conducted so well that many continuing efforts could still be noted. Community leaders trained in earlier years remained active, promoting specific benefits for their communities as well as improving bilingual education. Faculty members, former students, and currently enrolled students were still contributing their skills to community development. Parental assistance with many activities in the schools with bilingual education remained quite high. The important work begun through the project was still paying dividends.

A second kind of involvement, that of the teaching community, was evidenced throughout the 1981-1982 project year. Teachers and administrators from the school districts were included in the advisory committee to the project; they were used as resources for the work and contributed a great deal to the formulation of the general policies and the conduct of the program. They were not seen as "objects of the program," as is often the case, but as integral cooperators in a design and delivery system.

Still another important evidence of the project's concern for the inclusion of the teachers and administrators into the project was

the work of the liaison personnel. Every staff member was seen as a part of that system to provide services to, and at the same time gather information on needs from, the district personnel. Special liaison work was assigned as a part of some faculty members' work to ensure timely delivery of services to the schools and to the students. Regular visits were made to the schools, with advance notice, and assistance was given when requested. Further, reports on the monitoring of classes and on the assistance rendered provided a feedback to the project so it could improve.

The student evaluations of the liaison services have been more and more favorable through the project years. (A longitudinal report is included in a later section.) Some of this positive increase, of course, was due to the augmented capacity of the project to deliver this kind of service. The ratings also showed, however, that the teachers and administrators recognized that the University and the project could provide specialized services to bilingual education in their schools.

Other evidence of the recognition of the willingness and ability of the East Texas State University Title VII project to help with educational problems was that of the increased number of cooperating school districts. As new laws and regulations were promulgated, more and more districts called on the project to assist with compliance. Some districts have begun the planning and implementation of bilingual programs with the advice and counsel of project personnel, have urged their teachers to participate in the credentialing courses, and have made contributions to the work of the program. All of these, even those of only early formation, denoted acceptance of the Title VII project and its concern for involvement between the University and the districts.

While there are many positive sections to this evaluation report, probably no phase of the East Texas State University project reached the high degree of realization as that of professionalization. The author has evaluated university programs in Texas, Arizona, and California and has never found the superior quality evidenced at East Texas State University. The project was well integrated into the University, the school districts, and the communities. This commendable element in the project should be disseminated to other university projects and the personnel should be asked to assist others in achieving such a high degree of cooperation. Much of the project's success in other endeavors within its program was directly related to its commitment to professionalization - to its competence in the delivery of services to every part of its community.

Communications

The communications efforts were evident from all the explanations in the previous sections of this report, but they bear repeating for emphasis. The project worked hard at maintaining a dialogue with all its audiences: state agencies, other universities, its own university components, the districts, the Mexican American community, and the students. It actively provided information and sought information from them.

The staff obtained information about bilingual education and disseminated it to the affected audiences. It fostered and encouraged research and provided the findings in summary form. It interacted with the several components of the communities and reported the information as feedback. It is important to note that this was not constrained to "positive" information - negative input was also communicated. Special attention is called to several articles and editorials in *Boletín* and the specialized conferences conducted on campus that presented both the favorable and unfavorable aspects of or attributed to bilingual education. This free interchange was a vital part of the communications network. Unless negative feelings can be discovered and aired, and suitable replies given, bilingual education will continue in its "half life" existence of grudging acceptance because it's the law. The evaluator commends the staff on its open communications.

The willingness of the project staff to meet with any of its communities and discuss the work, bilingual education, community needs, and any other item of interest was one of its major characteristics. Many professionals, especially university faculty, act as if they feel they are the ultimate experts in their work and that interaction is either unnecessary or undesirable. A perusal of the excerpts of the many communications appended to this and the previous annual reports will show that this was not the case of the Title VII program staff.

The East Texas State University faculty generally, and the members of the bilingual education staff particularly, are to be commended for their work in keeping all segments of the community in communication with each other. Continual efforts to keep these communications open and frequent have resulted in a much higher level of professionalization, which in turn, has resulted in a more effective training program.

Resource Facilities

The project was especially cognizant of the need to provide a wide range of resource materials for the use of the faculty and students. While few Title VII funds were used in this acquisition, the project stimulated the collection of many materials and the accumulated resources were unusually large for such a short period. These, of course, must be continually updated but the 1981-1982 status of the collections was excellent.

The campus library has been a major force in providing the resource materials. Primarily utilizing its own funds, this University component collected together one of the best sets of materials yet examined by the evaluator. The collection was not only commendable for its materials on bilingual education but also on linguistics, Spanish, English, history, sociology, psychology, anthropology, and many other related fields. A part of the credit for this collection also was due to the faculty who examined the literature in their fields and suggested those that would be appropo as resources for bilingual education.

Some special curriculum materials have been purchased with Title VII funds over the years and these were housed in the project office and in the offices of the professors responsible for teaching the particular subjects. These were particularly important since so many special needs arise in bilingual education; the development efforts of others should be made available to the teachers and students and they were not only present but utilized in the University courses so that students became acquainted with them.

East Texas State University also maintained a study center in Dallas and it, too, housed some materials pertinent to the work of the project. That site facilitated the use of the materials by the part time students who worked all day and had fewer opportunities, except in the summer, to study on campus. The space in the study center was seriously crowded in past years but the move to new space substantially resolved the problem.

The professors who taught in the Dallas sites also carried great amounts of books and curriculum sets with them, further increasing the exposure of the students to the special materials. Those included curriculum resources for elementary and secondary classrooms, texts, supplementary materials, and audio visual aids. Some of the audio visual materials were also sent to the study center in Dallas to further aid the teachers in studying them.

The University also consolidated some resources that were not easily accessible to the students into a new learning center on campus. A system of carrels facilitated the study of materials on filmstrips, cassettes, multimedia kits, tapes, and records. Materials in many languages were thus made accessible and the Spanish and bilingual Spanish/English holdings were especially impressive. The consolidated system in one locale should encourage the use of the materials.

The Dallas Independent School District also maintained a considerable professional library and the students had access to it. Thus the cooperation between the two institutions increased the resources of both. The members of the North Texas Federation - Texas Christian University, Southern Methodist University, the University of Dallas, Texas Women's University, and North Texas State University, as well as East Texas State University - allowed students access to their library holdings. This was a mutually profitable cooperative function since it substantially increased the resources available to any one of the members.

Summary of the Process Variables

The external evaluator spent a great deal of time monitoring the entire process of the project in order to provide both written suggestions for improvement, through the interim reports, the conferences with the project and University administrators and teaching faculty, students, and district staff members. While the brief personal contacts restricted the information that could be gathered and imparted, planning the work carefully appeared to give adequate coverage and the conclusions about the process should be useful.

The administration had gone to unusual lengths to incorporate the project work into the regular University structure. While it had not yet been able to manage all of the institutionalization that was planned, primarily because of financial constraints, it had achieved far more than any of the other Title VII university projects the evaluator had studied. The inter-agency cooperation was high, especially with the participating school districts. Cooperation with the Texas Education Agency, particularly evident from the joint offering of the English as a Second Language courses and the move into the endorsement program for that subject, was strong. East Texas State University cooperation with other universities, especially those in the North Texas Federation, was excellent. Mutual assistance between the University and some of the education service centers, and Educational Dissemination and Assessment Center in Dallas, was very fruitful.

Despite some major changes in the University administration, the project did not lose its support. The new officers took time to become acquainted with the work, the staff, and the evaluations. The cooperation of the Dean of Education remained exemplary.

The thrust toward faculty development was very evident and the emphasis on the new field, English as a Second Language, further increased East Texas State University's capability. Evidence of added professionalization by the faculty and students was strong. The communications process was kept at a high level even though the funds for the news organ were reduced. Community involvement, despite withdrawal of funds for that purpose, was well developed within the University, with the districts and their teachers, and with the Mexican American community in the target areas. The collection of resources was excellent and the distance problem was alleviated by a Dallas collection and transportation system by the professors.

Even though noting some areas in which more improvement could be effected, the evaluator found only one area that had been only partially remedied, that of the undergraduate Spanish instruction. The new offices and the reduced load on the administrators was particularly helpful to the smooth operation of the project.

In summary, East Texas State University and the ESEA Title VII Bilingual Program had made substantial strides toward the best possible delivery of services to the students, the districts, and ultimately to the limited English speaking children in the State. The officials of both are congratulated for their persistent efforts toward their goals.

THE STUDENTS IN THE PROGRAM

East Texas State University conducted a needs assessment on the training required in the North Texas area at the beginning of its program. Utilizing the data available from the Texas Education Agency, published research, and surveys in the immediate geographic region, it was evident that the deficiencies in all levels of resources to conduct bilingual education were critical. The Mexican American population was growing very rapidly in the Dallas and Fort Worth areas; moderate increases were noted in the smaller population centers throughout the North Texas portion of the state.

The first thrust, and still the largest in terms of numbers, was the provision of bilingual education methods and techniques to already certified teachers in elementary schools. Two options were available: the courses needed for the endorsement to the elementary certificate and a full masters degree program in bilingual education. As soon as this program was stabilized, the University then planned and negotiated approved programs for undergraduates so they could enter the bilingual education field directly; a specialist program beyond the masters degree was needed that would equip experienced personnel to aid the administration and teachers in the implementation of bilingual education; and the doctorate in education, which would provide both specializations and at the same time furnish high level personnel for other functional positions in universities, agencies, and local administrations.

All four levels were direly needed throughout the North Texas area and the nation. Increases in the number of pupils that could benefit from bilingual education and programs to serve them, have kept the demand high. The four programs are still needed if the students in elementary and secondary schools are to be educated within an environment that will facilitate their abilities to enter, profit from, and contribute to the educational, social, political, and economic life of the state and the nation.

Program Participants

The majority of the East Texas State University Title VII participants came from the Dallas Independent School District, which cooperated directly with the program. Many others, however, came from other districts in the North Texas area, and recently, from all over Texas.

In the early years, almost all the participants were teachers in the first four grades of school since that was the emphasis for bilingual certification. Since that time, the numbers of participants from the other grades and from other positions in the schools have increased markedly, demonstrating an attraction to the East Texas State University program. That change is significant since several universities in the area offer some levels of training for bilingual education. The 1981-1982 undergraduate emphasis would augment the already existing supplies of teachers.

The University guarantees the privacy of information, therefore, the reporting on the several characteristics studied is voluntary. Too, many students participating in the courses are not assisted financially. The two factors mean that the percentages cited in the accompanying tables do not necessarily translate into the numbers officially registered as ESEA Title VII participants.

The wide variety of occupations of the reporting participants is displayed in Table 1. The changes across the years represent differing emphases in the schools on the provision of bilingual education and the group receiving special assistance from the project.

Table 1: Comparative Frequencies of Reporting Participants by Occupation from 1976 to 1982

Occupation	1976 %	1977 %	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Teacher:							
Kindergarten	10	12	12	14	12	4	3
Grades 1-3	46	47	48	43	30	27	22
Grades 4-6	13	13	14	4	15	12	9
Grades 7-8	4	2	4	8	3	8	6
Grades 9-12	3	1	4	7	7	6	5
Aide	*	*	*	*	6	8	5
Volunteer	0	0	0	0	1	2	1
Administrator	2	2	3	6	6	2	3
Computer/Media	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
Curriculum Writer	1	2	2	2	4	2	1
Resource Teacher	1	1	2	2	4	0	1
Student/unemployed	*	*	*	*	6	18	42
Unspecified other	15	13	11	24	1	4	1
No response	1	9	0	0	0	4	2

** Between the 1979 and 1980 reports, the computer program was expanded to account for these specifications formerly grouped under "other."*

The principal target area was the Dallas system; as the teachers in the system gained their credentials and/or masters degrees, some decreases were expected. However, these were partially offset by the inclusion of other area districts. The doctoral program also raised the number of participants from some professional categories. The large increase in students that were unemployed mostly resulted from first their inclusion in the program and the later emphasis on assistance to them.

The total and bilingual teaching experience of the students in the first few years was fairly stable. As many of the experienced instructors completed their certificates and degrees, the total experience diminished. The bilingual experience, on the other hand, continued to rise until 1982, when the higher proportion of undergraduates diluted that experience. The 1979 through the 1982 data are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Comparative Frequencies of the Total and Bilingual Teaching Experience of the Participants: 1979-1982

Experience Categories	Total				Bilingual			
	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
None	4	4	12	39	8	6	22	44
Less than 9 months	8	6	16	14	29	21	29	19
One to two years	18	11	16	11	22	11	16	14
Three to five years	29	39	14	11	25	38	14	5
Six to ten years	18	20	14	8	10	12	4	7
Eleven years and more	23	20	16	8	6	12	2	2
No Response	0	0	10	3	0	0	0	9

The previously noted undergraduate students increased the none category considerably, both in total and bilingual experience. The It must be emphasized that although the percentages of the more experienced teachers have declined, their numbers, and the immediate benefit to the classrooms in the schools, are still very great. Too, many of these upper teaching experience participants are in positions of considerable influence, increasing their utility to the bilingual education program as a whole in the districts and in the State.

Change also occurred in the male and female portions of the student population. The percentage of males decreased slightly from 1980 to 1981 but recovered in 1982.

Table 3: Male and Female Proportions among the Student Population

Sex	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Male	12	19	16	18
Female	88	81	84	82

Ethnicity changed a great deal in 1981 and some of that difference remained in 1982. In all the earlier years, Mexican Americans had made up more than half the group. In the latter years, the number of Mexican Americans, and their percentage, decreased while the other Latin Americans and the Anglos increased. It should be noted, however, that some Mexican Americans that speak little or no Spanish classified themselves in the "Anglo and other" grouping.

The proportion of the students that already held the bilingual endorsement grew very rapidly from 1977 through 1980. In 1981, however, the percentage dropped dramatically from the previous high of 64% to 26%. Many of the 1981 students were new to the program and had not yet had time to complete the certificate courses; the

Table 4: Reported Ethnicity Frequencies: 1979-1982

Ethnicity	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Mexican American	53	55	37	43
Other Latin American	*	7	8	10
Black	2	0	2	1
American Indian	0	0	2	2
Anglo and other	45	38	52	44

** These were subsumed under Anglo and other until 1980.*

high percentage of new undergraduate students in the 1982 project year further influenced the proportion, dropping it to 24%.

Six years of examining student characteristics has found important differences. The early years of being one of the first university programs to make the certificate and the masters degree in bilingual education available, attracted a large number of persons already in that field but who needed the credential and/or the degree. Later, Anglos and other groups were attracted to the program and thus some decline in the percentages, though not in the numbers, of Mexican Americans occurred. Similarly, the heavy emphasis on the undergraduate program in 1981 and 1982 further changed some of the percentages, reducing the experience and the proportion already holding the certificate.

The changes are seen as responding to the most immediate needs of the North Texas audience. The increases in children in the bilingual and English as a Second Language classes still require that some experienced teachers return for additional work. The specialists, too, are in demand. The University was able, however, to concentrate on the undergraduates and it did so successfully in the last two years of the program.

STUDENT PERCEPTIONS OF THE SERVICES

Many universities have begun programs for bilingual education; some of them have experienced little or no growth. One of the problems has been a restrictive set of course offerings that did not appeal to the students. Still another has been offerings by professors who were unprepared in bilingual education or who continually dwelt on philosophical issues or personal campaigns of one sort or another but who did not progress to a high degree of technical teacher preparation. None of these conditions has produced attractive programs to a large number of students.

To help assure that both the program and the courses met the students' needs, the East Texas State University Title VII project set up a close monitoring system, utilizing both expert judgment about the courses and the way they were taught, and student perceptions of the program as a whole and its parts. As each set of course observations was completed, oral and written interim reports were submitted so that the project administrators had the opportunity to talk with the instructors, giving helpful suggestions for improvement. In addition, the observor offered private, individual conferences to any professor that so requested, again to offer suggestions. Further, the students rated each course and the rating forms were sent to the evaluator. The results were summarized, sent to the administration, and offered to any professor that desired the information on his specific course.

The present document, because of the anonymity requirements, does not identify professors or courses; these were discussed as they related to the Title VII project's attempts to produce the best possible environment for learning. Reiterating from the methodology section, the student evaluations were voluntary, thus some courses received few ratings. Also, some courses in students' programs were not exclusively for bilingual education and one or only a few students might be enrolled in them. This reduced the statistical inferences that could be made from the ratings. The discussions in this chapter will be concerned principally, then, with those courses for which three or more forms were returned. The narrative suggestions, however, were utilized for the entire range of courses in which the reporting students were enrolled.

General Perceptions

The students were asked to rate the general program in which they were enrolled plus their fluency in Spanish. In addition to one point in time assessments, their ratings were examined across the years they were enrolled, giving both a cross sectional and a longitudinal analysis of these two general elements.

The first element, the degree design, was examined in the present report in two ways. First, the ratings by all students reporting each year were compared across the last four years (Most in 1981

and many in 1982 were just beginning their programs under the project and few chose to judge them at that point. This was particularly true for the undergraduates, many of whom were in their first two university years.) See Table 5.

Although the no response category grew in its percent of the total reporting, the ratings actually given on the degree design remained at the *strong* level, approximately 4 out of a possible range between 1 and 5. The increased capacity of the faculty to attend students, both on the home campus and in the Satellite Learning Center, may have accounted for the continued strength. The additional experience of the faculty with the existing degree plans no doubt added quality to their counseling.

Table 5: Rating Frequencies and Calculated Composite Ratings on Degree Design

Rating Category*	1978 %	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Very strong	10	6	18	14	16
Strong	47	53	51	41	41
Fair	39	30	27	16	8
Weak	1	2	1	2	0
Very Weak	1	0	0	0	0
No Response	2	10	3	27	35
Composite Rating	3.62	3.72	3.88	3.91	4.08

* *Very strong=5, strong=4, fair=3, weak=2, very weak=1; no response was excluded from the calculations for the composite rating.*

Since a high proportion of the students had been in the program a year or less, the remaining cells were sometimes vacant, making a strong statistical test for significance tenuous. Clearly, the difference between 1978 and 1982 was significant at the .001 level, a decidedly positive factor for the development of the advising faculty.

One general effect postulated by the program designers was the increased Spanish fluency of the students. Specific Spanish courses were offered and the utilization of Spanish within the other classes was also expected to have a salutary effect on fluency, as well as literacy. Students rated their fluency, oral and written, at the beginning of their programs at East Texas State University and every year thereafter. Nearly no changes in fluency in Spanish were registered between 1977 and 1978 but less than a year of learning time had elapsed. The following year, 1979, showed much higher ratings. Since then, the students have entered the program as others were graduating and the fluency ratings have not changed as much as might be expected; they prove to be a mathematical function of the entry/exit rather than fluency. In checking only those students that have been in the project courses for two or more

years, the 1981 group showed the most marked progress in written Spanish of any since the beginning of the program. Almost 80% began the program with a very low rating in written Spanish and judged their end of program status to be *fairly fluent* or *very fluent*. An important aspect to this increased writing ability, according to the comments of the respondents, was the graduate course in Spanish grammar, introduced during that period.

The 1982 group with two or more years in the program showed similar results; every student increased his rating at least one point on the scale and seven elevated the mark two points. Again, the comments centered on the grammar course, noting that they "now understand structure much more." Interestingly, too, two from other Latin American countries volunteered that they thought they were very fluent at the beginning but they learned so much in the course that they would change their beginning assessment. It must be noted, too, that the graduate Spanish courses all enjoyed very high ratings and many students discussed the overall quality of the Spanish program as instrumental in their progress. The undergraduates, however, did not change their fluency ratings in two years, apparently a function in keeping with their substantial criticisms of the courses.

Although potentially general in its effects, the clinical assistance/liaison program was also included as a possible individual student influence. Since much of the help is to schools rather than individuals, some students had no opportunity to observe the work; this was particularly true for the undergraduates who were, of course, not in a school setting. The no response category has always been large through the years but it was especially so in 1982, a reflection of the increased proportion of undergraduates. Nevertheless, those who rated the liaison activities found them as *fairly effective*, a reasonable rating for the contact they had. Table 6 shows the separate category percentages and a comparison across time shows the judgments to have remained quite stable across the last four years.

Table 6: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of Student Perceptions of the Clinical Assistance/Liaison Services: 1979-1982

Scale Categories*	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Very effective	16	20	16	17
Fairly effective	13	27	4	10
Not effective	4	6	0	0
No opportunity to observe	38	31	25	44
No response	29	16	55	29
Composite rating	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.4

**Very effective=2; fairly effective=1; not effective=0.*

Few evaluator observations of the liaison services were conducted in 1982 due to the press of other evaluation tasks. In those that were seen, the assistance appeared to be appropriate for the occasion and they were certainly well received.

The consultant part of the project was conducted both in Dallas and on the Commerce campus. In each instance, therefore, attendance for some students was difficult and impossible for others. Providing conferences in both sites, however, was important to reaching a greater number of the participants. Nevertheless, as seen in Table 7, the no opportunity/no response grouping remained large.

Table 7: Frequencies and Composite Ratings of Participant Perceptions of the Consultant Component: 1979-1982

Scale Categories*	1979 %	1980 %	1981 %	1982 %
Very useful	29	25	23	31
Fairly useful	33	34	27	28
Not useful	6	6	2	5
No opportunity/no response	32	31	48	36
Composite rating	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.5

* *Very useful=2; fairly useful=1; not useful=0. No response was not utilized in the composite calculations.*

An important point in the consultant component was that a higher percentage of the students attended in 1982 than in 1981. The undergraduates attended at about the same rate as the graduates. A sizable segment of the students commented on one particular conference made available to them through the Desegregation Project of East Texas State University; they were very impressed with the content and the delivery style of the speaker. All of the comments about any consultant were positive. The combined utilization of conferences sponsored by the Title VII and the Desegregation projects, those by special campus groups, and the general University bureau brought a wide range of topics and views to the students and that was appreciated by them.

Overview of the Services

The major service components have generally been judged at about a fair rating across the years. In 1982, the students' degree designs were judged strong and numerically higher than previously. Spanish fluency raised about like other years except that written fluency was quite high, a rating that had first appeared in 1981. The liaison service continued at a level judged fair "plus" and the consultant conferences were at about the same level. The inclusion of larger numbers of undergraduates modified only the Spanish fluency ratings.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE INSTRUCTION

The East Texas State University Title VII project has emphasized the improvement in the delivery of its services to the students. The provision of materials, professors experienced in bilingual education, and assistance to those professors was expected to create a teaching/learning environment that would maximize the participant benefits from this most important portion of the program. Greater learning by the students, who are the teachers and specialists in the districts, would then benefit the pupils in those districts by increasing their learning.

University systems are such that a special project cannot demand changes in the way the courses are taught; it can only offer assistance and suggestions so that those who want to improve can do so. Individual professors are jealous of their courses and sometimes resist modifications that might make their work more acceptable to students, reasoning that their subject matter is more important than what the students think. Too, circumstances do not always permit a University the ideal choice for an instructor in a particular course. East Texas State University has continually worked toward the long range goal of improved teaching, both by offering assistance and by choosing the best personnel it can find.

Some subjects, however, are less well received in and of themselves and these tend to receive less favorable evaluations from students. Subjects that are totally new to the students, ones that require an unusual amount of outside study, and those that are more theoretical than practical are among the less favored materials. Additionally, not all students perceive the conduct of a course alike. Variations in their perspectives, their preparation, and their intentions when they signed up for a course all contribute to differentials in the ratings given.

Nevertheless, the University insists that student perceived information about the courses is a valuable input to the improvement of the project services. The six year experience of the evaluator with this program demonstrated that such is the case. Each year several professors have requested private information about their course ratings, have discussed the student perceived deficiencies and strengths with the evaluator, and have subsequently modified the offerings such that their ratings have improved.

Two types of information were gathered about the courses: one was the ratings on the courses and the instructional components of them. The ratings provided direct measurement for the evaluation and benchmarks against which the professors could strive for improvement. The second type was suggestions from the students on how to improve the courses. These were important adjuncts to the scale values (*very strong, strong, fair, weak, very weak*) on a Likert scale of 1 to 5 (a reversed polarity), which allows for statistical analyses of the results. The suggestions for improvement and the general comments about courses are usually not quantified since their voluntary

inclusion does not necessarily indicate the number of students holding that opinion.

In a few instances, a comment or suggestion will be so pervasive that the proportion of students indicating it is provided, either because the number was small and therefore might not represent the ideas of the group, or when the number was large and thus demonstrated a general perception. The anonymity of the professors was guaranteed and that sometimes caused comments to be deleted from the report since their inclusion would point directly to one instructor. When a suggestion was positive, posing no threat to the professor, it was incorporated even though identification might be possible.

Program Design

Each student was asked to comment on or offer suggestions about how the general design of the program could be enhanced. Across the four years, these have decreased considerably, apparently reflecting the higher positive ratings given the courses during that time. That is, it appeared that in most cases when students were satisfied with the courses, they felt less inclined to write out general comments. That is not absolute, however, since two conditions in 1979-1980 caused them to include substantial narrative information, as will be shown. The positive comments were repeated in 1981 and 1982.

First, two less than positive conditions were commented on extensively. Over the years, but in lesser quantities each year, the students have expected that the professors would use more Spanish in the conduct of the classes. As discussed in a previous section, the amount of Spanish that could be used was in part dictated by the proficiency of the professor and in part that of the students. The suggestions did note differences but still indicated their own concerns for greater fluency in Spanish and the recognition that its utilization in the classes could help them improve.

The second type of comment was that engendered by perceived improper conduct of a course. The students might be generally satisfied with their program but regard a particular course as needing improvement. While some of these were discussed earlier, the most important ones are reiterated here for emphasis:

- Students expected that Spanish would be the dominant language in a Spanish course; they objected strenuously when one undergraduate course was taught primarily in English.
- Both Mexican Americans and non-Mexican Americans objected to disparaging remarks made about Mexican Americans and/or about their Spanish.
- Criticisms about several undergraduate, non-program courses were frequent; the grading system was criticized in four of the courses.
- The graduate courses, especially those on Spanish, enjoyed very favorable comments.

These findings were relayed to the administration of the project and to those professors that requested private information on their own courses. The project and University administrations were aware of most of these problems and were seeking ways to alleviate them. At least one professor made a determined effort to improve the delivery of the courses between the fall and spring sessions and the spring comments showed some success in this regard.

The positive comments, mentioned earlier, far out weighed those that were less favorable. In fact, most courses received a considerable number of notes about the amount of learning, the excellent information that had been imparted, and the methods used in teaching them.

Another kind of suggestion emanated from a 1981 course added to the program. All the students but one in that course took the time to write a substantial narrative about it, praising the professor, the project, and the inclusion of the course in the design. As an illustration of the strength of the offering, the following excerpts from the comments are presented:

> ...this course should be a prerequisite, to be taken before the other bilingual courses ..
>
> ...this course should be offered at the beginning of the Masters program.
>
> I learned more about writing and improving my Spanish fluency in this course than in any I have ever taken.
>
> ...is to be congratulated for the finest course ever presented in this or any other program in which I have been enrolled.
>
> Now I want more; a followup course or courses on Spanish grammar and composition would greatly improve this program.

These are especially important judgments since the students were by no means talking about an easy course. Included in their comments were phrases such as "...toughest course ever..." "...hard professor but knows her business and how to teach it..." "worked harder on this course than all the rest combined." The only negative comments, and those were still tempered by praise for the course and the professor, came from students who felt that their level of proficiency in Spanish caused them some difficulties.

Nearly every student suggested that the course be offered very early (or first) in the program. It would appear to the evaluator, however, that some study of the case should precede such a move. A good many of the students in this course were not very proficient in Spanish when they began their work at East Texas State University. No doubt some could have taken the course almost immediately but some would have had many difficulties and perhaps not have learned as much as they did at this later time. If there were enough students, the best might be to offer a section early to students very fluent in Spanish and then another later on for those that need to improve their fluency first.

The 1982 comments on this course were the same or similar to those in 1981. An interesting occurrence, because it was the first in the six years, was that one Mexican American responded totally in Spanish. Her comments on the course are worth noting:

> ...y por primera vez, después de hablar español toda mi vida, entiendo el porqué de las reglas de composición y ortografía. Ahora, sí, puedo explicarlas a mis estudiantes.

"After speaking Spanish all my life, I now for the first time understand the rules and can explain them to my students." Since biliteracy has been found to be associated with high achievement scores, improvements she may now be able to make in her instruction are very likely to bear results.

Ratings of the Courses

The increase in the number of undergraduate students in the 1981-1982 program has had many effects on the evaluation items; many have already been noted. The most dramatic, however, is in the number of courses for which evaluations were available. In the early years of the project, 10 to 14 were rated. In 1980-1981, 20 were included. The 1981-1982 ratings comprised 81 courses. And, of course, the number of fields covered was also greatly increased.

This plethora of listings makes it difficult to characterize the instruction in a comprehensible way. The details, course by course, and factor by factor, were made available in the interim reports to the director of the project; their repetition herein would add nothing to the evaluation. Instead, the subjects are grouped by major category, distinctive elements within them, and according to the level of the instruction: lower division, upper division, and graduate. The means, then, for each subject by level were calculated across the courses comprised.

Particular caution must be exercised in viewing the results. The number of students reporting on some courses was often one or two. No information is available on how other students in the courses might have rated them. The information is important from the students' point of view but should not be generalized to include all enrolled in the courses.

Table 8 contains the summary information on the subjects reported by the participants. Note first that the rating scale is reversed for this section: 1=*very strong* to 5=*very weak*. The most important observation is the unusually high quality of the vast majority of the subjects. Almost all of them cluster around *strong*. Too, in all but three cases (marked with **) the mean was closely representative of the mean for the separate courses.

Equally important is to observe the ratings on the so-called "hard" subjects such as mathematics and science; they range from *strong* to *very strong*. The graduate courses were also uniformly rated very high. That is noteworthy because 1982 was the first year in which that happened.

Table 8: Mean Ratings of the Subject Areas, Subjects, and Levels of the Reporting Participants 1981-1982

Area/Subject	No. Courses	No. Students	Overall Ratings* Lower Div.	Upper Div.	Graduate
Languages:					
English	10	14	1.8	1.9	-
Spanish	16	57	3.1**	3.6	1.2
French	2	3	-	2.3	-
German	2	2	1.5	-	-
Education:					
Elementary	12	66	3.0	2.0	1.6
Other	2	7	-	-	1.6
Social Sciences:					
History	5	11	2.5	1.4	1.3
Political Science	6	6	2.5	-	-
Sociology	4	7	3.0	1.3	-
Anthropology	1	3	-	2.0	-
Psychology	4	9	1.5	2.5**	-
Math/Science:					
Mathematics	4	7	1.8	-	-
Biology	2	3	1.5	-	-
Earth Science	1	1	1.0	-	-
Geography	1	2	-	2.0	-
Others:					
Business	1	1	2.0	-	-
Speech	2	4	2.0	-	-
Linguistics	2	7	-	3.3	-
Physical Education	4	4	2.7**	-	-

* *REVERSED POLARITY: 1=very strong; 2=strong; 3=fair; 4=weak; 5=very weak.*

***The mean masks some that were very high and some very low in this group.*

Isolating those subjects that had been evaluated across the six years was a somewhat difficult task because the numbers changed on some of them. The tests for statistical significance showed two sets of program courses to have significantly improved: the graduate set as a whole, and the elementary education courses specifically. It must be emphasized, however, that some of the others could not change much (graduate Spanish is an example), therefore, "lack of improvement" is not a mark against them.

In general, then, the students perceived the courses and the way they were taught as a positive factor in their development. Their positive ratings of both subject matter and teacher preparation courses were important since both are necessary for effective teachers. The ESEA Title VII project and the University are to be congratulated.

REPORT SUMMARY

The 1981-1982 ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education project at East Texas State University was operated on funds from the University, the US Department of Education, and some monies from the Texas Education Agency for specific courses. Emphasis this year was on the undergraduate level, but some masters, specialist, and doctoral assistance was granted.

The program's goals sought the enhancement of learning and educational opportunities for all children; they specifically were aimed at those with limited English speaking proficiency. The means to those ends was the preparation of high quality bilingual teachers, teachers of English as a Second Language, specialists in those subjects and the support fields, and administrators capable of managing such programs. Measurable objectives were stated for the project and this external evaluation, together with the reports from internal monitoring, were designed to assure the appropriate provision of the services and the instruction to the participants. It was expected that success in the project's objectives would aid in better learning by the University students and then transmitted to the children of the service area, that of North Texas, and thus contribute to progress across the nation.

The evaluation was comprised of both formative and summative aspects to furnish immediate feedback to the administration while modifications could still be effected, and subsequently, an overall assessment of the conduct and the results of the project. Document reviews, interviews, observations, questionnaires, and opinionnaires were the principal methods utilized to obtain the data. Activities on the Commerce campus and at the Satellite Learning Center in Dallas were monitored twice during the year.

The project began in cooperation with the Dallas schools but since progressed to ten others. Cooperation with other universities, with education service centers, and dissemination and assessment centers was active. Unusually strong interactions were chronicled with the Texas Education Agency. Internally, the project works well with the departments and the colleges; a campus wide committee is active in advising the direction of the activities. Major changes among the University administrative personnel did not diminish the thrust of the program.

Courses are offered in several settings for the convenience of the students and to enhance the practicality of the offerings: the home campus, the Dallas center, and in schools of the participating districts. The main campus library has an impressive holding of bilingual and related subject materials for study; the Dallas center expanded its materials considerably in 1982. Professors transport large amounts of materials with them when they teach in other sites, thus facilitating the study of the students in those places. The administration, divided this year between a project director and bilingual program coordinator, was able to manage the services necessary for the several sites efficiently.

The communications about bilingual education and other topics of interest to the several audiences remained at a high level during this year. The University newspaper, the faculty newsletter, and the project organ, *Boletín*, provided excellent internal coverage. Articles in area newspapers, on the radio, and in television programs further expanded the network.

The major services to the students and the districts continued although some in less intensity because of withdrawal or reductions of funds. The liaison work was rated similar to previous years; the consultant conferences somewhat higher than before. The degree design function raised considerably and that was a significant rise when compared to the first year of operation. Community involvement was still active but a little less than when funds for that component allowed for more intensive efforts.

The University demonstrated its continuing commitment to the project through furnishing greatly expanded and more efficient office space. The already mentioned division of duties for the administrators further denoted institutionalization. All courses, degrees, and certificates had been incorporated into the regular program. Only one faculty member had not yet been placed on tenure track status; the problem was being discussed but resolution had not yet occurred. Professionalization of the faculty and the students was very high; all faculty held doctorates, had training and experience in bilingual education or the appropriate related topics, and continued to progress in their competencies. Student work was substantially increased in fluency, notably in written Spanish that had been low. Student research work, both for the research course and for the doctorate, was very good.

The heart of the project, the instruction of the students, was rated high by the expert observor and by the student participants. While a few courses were still posing problems, particularly in undergraduate Spanish, most had significantly improved across the years. It was important, too, that the students rated the subject matter and the teaching preparation courses, on the whole, as well delivered. Graduate courses generally, mathematics and science courses, and graduate Spanish instruction received a superior rating. The project continued to strive toward even more excellence in 1982 than it had achieved previously, a very high mark indeed.

The evaluator works with several university programs and evaluates three. The East Texas State University program is easily the most integrated into the university system, equals the others in reaching the target students, and is superior to most in the quality of the instruction. The East Texas State University ESEA Title VII project is an example of federal monies spent wisely and effectively. The University's efforts and the student needs cause it to be recommended for continued funding, without reservation.

REFERENCES

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY. Bilingual training program: proposal. 1976.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY. Bilingual training program: continuation proposal. 1981.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY. Catalog (graduate and undergraduate). 1981-1982.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY. Student teaching handbook. 1980.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY. Boletín. 1981-1982.

JONES, EARL. External evaluation of the East Texas State University ESEA Title VII project: 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981.

1981-1982 interim reports:

I: January 10, 1982.
II: April 3, 1982.
III: June 21, 1982.

DIRECTORS OF BILINGUAL TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS. Considerations of bilingual teacher education. September 17, 1981.

COMMITTEE ON BILINGUAL EDUCATION. Proposal for the English as a second language endorsement. 1982.

APPENDIX A

Evaluator Resume

Earl Jones, EdD

Dr. Jones is a Senior Associate with Development Associates, serving full time since 1974 in many positions of research, evaluation, education, and administration. He concurrently holds the rank of professor in bilingual education at Pacific Oaks College and has held professoral and administrative positions with Antioch University, Incarnate Word College, Texas A&M University, University of Chile, University of California at Los Angeles, Catholic University of Venezuela, and the Inter-American Institute of the Organization of American States, with appointments in both sociology and education. He is currently a member of the California State Advisory Committee on Research in Bilingual Education.

Dr. Jones' primary areas of work with Development Associates have included:

- Research and evaluation in bilingual education;
- Studies and evaluations of vocational, preschool, university, and informal education;
- Prestudies and investigations in rural development: education, extension, economics, credit, cooperatives, manpower training and management, and socioeconomic factors;
- General advisor on research design, methodologies, data controls, computerization, and analysis.

Since he is fully fluent in Spanish and Portuguese, and directs and serves as a researcher and trainer in those languages for the World Bank, universities, and the company both in the United States and in Latin America. He has some knowledge of Arabic, Russian, Magyar, and Guaraní.

Dr. Jones has long experience in literacy programs, rural schools, and studies of them. He was a rural teacher for ten years in Oregon and California at the beginning of his career. Later he was an Organization of American States consultant in general rural education and literacy programs in Costa Rica (Spanish), Brazil (Portuguese), Mexico (Spanish), and Paraguay (Guaraní, Spanish), helping organize the instruction and supervise the preparation of didactic materials. In Texas, he helped develop the earliest bilingual programs in schools and universities, and served on the Governor's Committee for Bilingual Bicultural Education for three years. He also wrote and published the first year's bilingual language arts, social studies, and mathematics materials for adult education there.

Dr. Jones directed the three year study of bilingual education for the California Legislature. That impact study tracked 11,000 students' reading, language, and mathematics scores longitudinally. The achievement variables were controlled by degree of English proficiency, first language, SES, migrant/special/regular status; services in L1, L2, ESL, other language classes, individualized program; and via classroom observations for exposure to instruction, language mix, grouping approach, instructional qualities, and language proficiency of the teachers and aides. Perceived satisfaction was measured as an impact variable from older students, aides, teachers, administrators, parents, and other community members. To

date it is the largest bilingual education impact sutdy in the literature; the study has enjoyed the acceptance of researchers and practitioners and is used as a supplementary text in many university graduate study programs.

Dr. Jones served as a research consultant and conducted many of the case studies for the Development Associates study of the classroom instructional components in bilingual education for the US Department of Education; the report is scheduled for release later this year. He is currently managing the control and conversion of the achievement data for the Development Associates contract on Indian Education, and advises on the association of several program, student, and social variables with those scores in the analysis plan. That study is still in progress.

The researcher was the technical director of the five year study of the National Institute of Education experimental schools program in the Edgewood District, San Antonio, Texas. Impact variables of attitude, self concept, motivation, and achievement were collected and analyzed for nearly 5,000 students in that program. The research involved detailed examinations of the psychometric properties of the Self Concept and Motivation Inventory and the Purdue Social Attitude Scales for Primary Children. Nineteen technical volumes were issued from the evaluation.

Dr. Jones is accomplished in the management of socioeconomic survey teams. Local, multi-disciplinary survey crews were formed, trained, and supervised by him in Costa Rica, Brazil, Dominican Republic, Jamaica, Ghana, and Panama. In two massive studies in Venezuela, 40 team members conducted a two year regional socioeconomic study of the entire Bailadores region and a one year effort in the barrios of Caracas. As director of a recent user preference survey, he supervised the design, instrumentation, and interviewing of many surveyors via telephone in several languages.

Since joining Development Associates, he has served in the following capacities:

- Co-Researcher in the evaluation of the Agency for International Development mission in the Dominican Republic efforts in private sector development.
- Co-Researcher in the Title IV Indian education evaluation.
- Co-Researcher in the Title VII bilingual classroom instruction component study.
- Co-Director of the user preference survey for Pacific Telephone Company.
- Co-Researcher on an evaluative assessment of a training and technical assistance program for personnel of agricultural cooperatives in Honduras and in the formulation of a generic scope design for AID's projects in cooperatives.
- Team Leader for the evaluation of the Food for Peace program in Panama, with work in nutrition, economic factors, and management of the products.

- Team Leader for the evaluation of the Food for Peace program in Ghana.
- Project Director for the three year longitudinal study of California's educational services to limited and non-English speaking students for the California Legislature.
- Management Consultant to many western migrant training programs for the US Department of Labor.
- Educational Consultant to USAID/Guatemala for the design and preparation of a project identification description and later the project paper for management education in Guatemala.
- Co-Researcher in the evaluation of the services of the bilingual service center at San Diego State University in California from 1978 to 1982.
- Principal Investigator in the evaluation of the Title VII bilingual training program of East Texas State University from 1976 to 1982.
- Principal Researcher in the evaluation of ESEA Title VII programs in school districts in Elgin, Edcouch-Elsa, McAllen, Edgewood (San Antonio), Harlandale (San Antonio), in Texas, and Redwood City in California.
- Co-Researcher on a project to produce a self evaluation guide for migrant health programs.
- Technical Director of the National Institute of Education evaluation of the experimental schools program in the Edgewood District in San Antonio, Texas.

In addition, Dr. Jones has assisted many other research and evaluation programs of the company, chiefly in the formulation of their designs, data collection and control systems, and on the analysis of data.

Immediately prior to joining Development Associates, Dr. Jones was the higher education consultant to the Mexican American Cultural Center in San Antonio, Texas, professor with Antioch University, and a member of the President's Commision on Hispanic Affairs. Just before that multiple assignment, he was president of Incarnate Word College in the same city.

Earlier, he was professor of sociology and education, and associate dean of the College of Education at Texas A&M University. During the five years there he also headed special development programs in multicultural and bilingual education, adult and continuing education, vocational projects, and chaired groups for outreach efforts in science and technology. He was a full member of the graduate faculty. During his tenure there he served three years as President of the Southwest Association for Adult and Continuing Education.

Dr. Jones was associate professor at the University of California at Los Angeles in social psychology. He also served in overseas positions for that institution as director of the University of California - University of California Project and concurrently held a professoral appointment in sociology at the University of Chile campusses in Santiago and Valparaiso. Before that assignment he was the

UCLA representative to the research work conducted by the La Salle Foundation in Venezuela and was professor of sociology at Catholic University André Bello in Caracas. He directed the socioeconomic studies of two regions in Venezuela during that period.

Formerly, he was assistant professor of sociology and rural education at the Inter-American Institute of the Organization of American States in Turrialba, Costa Rica. In addition to teaching, he conducted research in every country in the Americas on short term assignment, assisted in the formation of extension and credit services, and consulted on the reformation of many university and local education services. Before joining the OAS, Dr. Jones had been a vocational and other subjects teacher in high schools in Oregon and California; he worked part time as director of farm and other special programming for two radio stations in Oregon.

After nearly four years service with the US Marine Corps in the Pacific during World War II, Dr. Jones received his baccalaureate in agriculture and vocational education from Oregon State University. He earned the masters degree in sociology from the Inter-American Institute of the OAS, and his doctorate in social psychology and education from Montana State University. He also did special studies at the College of Idaho, Stanford University, and the Royal Academy of Denmark. He has taught special courses for the University of Guadalajara, LaVerne University, the University of Puerto Rico, the World Bank, San Antonio College, and Stanford University.

Dr. Jones has authored and co-authored many books, monographs, articles, and other publications over the years. Chief among these:

YOUNG, MALCOLM & JONES, EARL. Evaluative assessment of the 1976-1977 training and technical assistance project for personnel in cooperatives in Honduras. 1982.

CULBERTSON, ROBERT; JONES, EARL & CORPEÑO, ROBERTO. Evaluation of USAID/Dominican Republic's projects in private sector development. 1982.

JONES, EARL; ROBLES, ELIODORO; THOMPSON, JOAN & COLEMAN, GEORGE. Evaluación del programa Alimentos para la Paz, Título II, en Panamá. 1981.

JONES, EARL; ROUSSEL, ROBERT & BERKOWITZ, SARAH. Evaluation of the Title II Food for Peace program in Ghana. 1981.

JONES, EARL; ROBLES, ELIODORO; MUÑOZ, ADOLFO & BERKOWITZ, SARAH. Evaluation of California's services to limited and non-English speaking students. 1980.

MUÑOZ, ADOLFO; WARDLAW, BARRY & JONES, EARL. Self evaluation guide for migrant health projects. 1978.

JONES, EARL. The 1978-1979 annual report and three year longitudinal study of the Edgewood Title VII bilingual program. 1980.

JONES, EARL. The external evaluation of the Title VII bilingual project in the Redwood City Schools. 1980. 1981.

JONES, EARL. The external evaluation of the ESEA Title VII bilingual training program at East Texas State University. 1976 - 1981.

ROBLES, ELIODORO; MUÑOZ, ADOLFO & JONES, EARL. The external evaluation of the Bilingual Education Service Center, San Diego State University. 1978 - 1982.

JONES, EARL & DAVIS, PETER. Final summary report on the experimental schools project, Edgewood Independent School District. 1977.

JONES, EARL. Social attitudes of South Texas primary children. 1977.

BERNAL, HELEN; JONES, EARL & CERVANTES, ROBERT. Psychosocial growth and achievement of Mexican American students. 1977.

CERVANTES, ROBERT; BERNAL, HELEN & JONES, EARL. Educational change: case studies in the experimental schools program. 1977.

JONES, EARL. An instrumentation study of the Purdue Social Attitude Scales for Primary Children, English and Spanish versions. 1976.

JONES, EARL. An instrumentation study of the Self Concept and Motivation Inventory, English and Spanish versions. 1976.

JONES, EARL. A study of primary pupil performance in language arts in the Elgin Independent School District. 1976.

JONES, EARL. The evaluation of the Edcouch-Elsa ESEA Title VII bilingual and special mathematics programs. 1976.

POTTER, FRANCIS J.; JONES, EARL & CERVANTES, ROBERT A. Teacher classroom behaviors. 1976.

CERVANTES, ROBERT A. & JONES, EARL. Locus of control and achievement of Mexican American pupils. 1976.

SHARP, MICHAEL; CERVANTES, ROBERT & JONES, EARL. A multidimensional study of self concept of Mexican American students. 1975.

JONES, EARL (ed.) Latin American literature for youth. 1972.

JONES, EARL (ed.) Perspectives on Latin America. 1971.

HUBERT, FRANK & JONES, EARL (eds.) Introduction to Latin American cultures. 1970.

JONES, EARL ET AL. Bailadores: un estudio socioeconómico de la región de Bailadores, Venezuela. 1966.

DI FRANCO, JOSEPH & JONES, EARL. Evaluation of the agricultural extension services in Costa Rica. 1965.

JONES, EARL ET AL. Liderança rural no Brasil. 1963.

JONES, EARL ET AL. A study of rural leadership in Bermaddy, Jamaica. 1962.

FOOTE, NATHAN & JONES, EARL. El mundo del barrio en Caracas, Venezuela. 1962.

Earl Jones is listed in many publications: *Who's Who in the West, Outstanding Educators of the South and Southwest, and International Biography.* He was selected for membership in Phi Kappa Phi and Alpha Zeta honoraries, was Pan American and Kellogg Foundation fellow. He received a Standard Oil Foundation Award for Outstanding Teaching and a Presidential Citation from the Government of Guatemala. He is a member of the American Academy of Science, American Sociological Association, and the American Education Research Association.

UCLA representative to the research work conducted by the La Salle Foundation in Venezuela and was professor of sociology at Catholic University André Bello in Caracas. He directed the socioeconomic studies of two regions in Venezuela during that period.

Formerly, he was assistant professor of sociology and rural education at the Inter-American Institute of the Organization of American States in Turrialba, Costa Rica. In addition to teaching, he conducted research in every country in the Americas on short term assignment, assisted in the formation of extension and credit services, and consulted on the reformation of many university and local education services. Before joining the OAS, Dr. Jones had been a vocational and other subjects teacher in high schools in Oregon and California; he worked part time as director of farm and other special programming for two radio stations in Oregon.

After nearly four years service with the US Marine Corps in the Pacific during World War II, Dr. Jones received his baccalaureate in agriculture and vocational education from Oregon State University. He earned the masters degree in sociology from the Inter-American Institute of the OAS, and his doctorate in social psychology and education from Montana State University. He also did special studies at the College of Idaho, Stanford University, and the Royal Academy of Denmark. He has taught special courses for the University of Guadalajara, LaVerne University, the University of Puerto Rico, the World Bank, San Antonio College, and Stanford University.

Dr. Jones has authored and co-authored many books, monographs, articles, and other publications over the years. Chief among these:

YOUNG, MALCOLM & JONES, EARL. Evaluative assessment of the 1976-1977 training and technical assistance project for personnel in cooperatives in Honduras. 1982.

CULBERTSON, ROBERT; JONES, EARL & CORPENO, ROBERTO. Evaluation of USAID/Dominican Republic's projects in private sector development. 1982.

JONES, EARL; ROBLES, ELIODORO; THOMPSON, JOAN & COLEMAN, GEORGE. Evaluación del programa Alimentos para la Paz, Título II, en Panamá. 1981.

JONES, EARL; ROUSSEL, ROBERT & BERKOWITZ, SARAH. Evaluation of the Title II Food for Peace program in Ghana. 1981.

JONES, EARL; ROBLES, ELIODORO; MUÑOZ, ADOLFO & BERKOWITZ, SARAH. Evaluation of California's services to limited and non-English speaking students. 1980.

MUÑOZ, ADOLFO; WARDLAW, BARRY & JONES, EARL. Self evaluation guide for migrant health projects. 1978.

JONES, EARL. The 1978-1979 annual report and three year longitudinal study of the Edgewood Title VII bilingual program. 1980.

JONES, EARL. The external evaluation of the Title VII bilingual project in the Redwood City Schools. 1980. 1981.

JONES, EARL. The external evaluation of the ESEA Title VII bilingual training program at East Texas State University. 1976 - 1981.

APPENDIX B

Project Forms

PROGRAMAS BILINGÜES
BILINGUAL PROGRAMS

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY

To: Liaison Report Form

From:

Re:

School Principal: _____

Total School Enrollment: _____ % Mexican-Americans _____

Class visited _____ Number of students _____

Name of teacher _____

Certified bilingual? _____

Proficiency in the Spanish language: Outstanding _____ Very good _____

Good: _____ Fair _____ Poor _____

Number of Spanish dominant students in the class _____ Bilingual _____

English dominant _____ Other _____

Total number of Spanish reading groups _____

Number of students in each Spanish reading group _____

Total number of English reading groups _____

Number of students in each English reading group _____

Materials used to teach Spanish reading _____

_____

Other subjects taught in Spanish _____

_____

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY — Commerce, Texas 75428

Amount of time spent each day teaching ESL by: Teacher _____

Resource teacher _____ Aide _____

Materials used to teach ESL: _____

_____

Any teaching of SSL? _____

Approximate total amount of time spent each day teaching in Spanish _____

_____

Any team teaching? _____

_____

Amount of time bilingual aid spends in the classroom: _____

_____

Any parental involvement? _____

_____

Teacher's suggestions, questions or special classroom situations:

Additional comments:

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY - BILINGUAL TRAINING PROGRAM
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM--FORM B (PROGRAM EVALUATION)

Social Security No._____ For_____ Semester of 19____
Please complete once for each semester enrolled.
What suggestions do you have for improving the following?(use back or additional sheet if necessary)

1. Language Program

   a. Spanish language

   b. English language

   c. Literature

   d. Linguistics

2. Culture Program

   a. Historical Aspects

   b. Socio-Anthropology Aspects

   c. Psychological Aspects

3. Teaching Methodology

   a. Kinds of methods presented

   b. The way the methods are taught

4. Research

   a. Methods of doing research

   b. Applications of research methods

5. Looking at your graduate degree program as a whole, from what you can tell at this point, how would you rate it?

   _____very weak _____fair _____very strong
   _____weak _____strong

6. How would you rate fluency in Spanish at this point in the program?

a) oral	b) written
____very fluent	____very fluent
____fairly fluent	____fairly fluent
____know some Spanish	____know some Spanish
____still know nearly no Spanish	____still know nearly no Spanish

7. Please list the kind(s) of information and or technique(s) you obtained this semester through the program which have been most useful to you in your classroom:

8. How would you rate the effectiveness of the clinical assistance/liaison program (school visits) in helping you.

_____very effective ____fairly effective ____no opportunity or did not use
_____not effective ____requested but was not scheduled

9. How would you rate the usefulness of the consultant presentations at general meetings

_____very useful _____fairly useful _____not useful

I attended ____all____some____none.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY - BILINGUAL TRAINING PROGRAM
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM--FORM A (DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION)

Social Security No._____ For_____ Semester of 19____
Please complete at conclusion of first semester of enrollment.

1. Present occupation:
   _____teacher, grades 1-3
   _____teacher, grades 4-6
   _____teacher, grades 7-8
   _____teacher, grades 9-12
   _____Administrator: _____
   _____Other (aide, substitute, and any other not covered; please specify:_____

2. Total teaching experience:
   _____Less than 9 months
   _____1-2 years
   _____3-5 years
   _____6-10 years
   _____11 or more

3. Total bilingual teaching experience:
   _____Less Than 9 months
   _____1-2 years
   _____3-5 years
   _____6-10 years
   _____11 or more

4. Sex: Male_____ Female_____

5. Ethnicity: Mexican American_____Black_____Anglo & Other_____

6. Do you have bilingual education endorsement? yes_____no_____

7. If yes, endorsement obtained through...
   _____Local School District Committee
   _____College or university certification program

8. When you began this East Texas State bilingual graduate program, how fluent were you in Spanish?

a) Speaking (oral fluency):	b) Writing:
_____very fluent	_____very fluent
_____fairly fluent	_____fairly fluent
_____knew a little Spanish	_____knew a little Spanish
_____knew no Spanish	_____knew no Spanish

9. I gained fluency in Spanish...
   _____at home in the U.S. (e.g. in Texas, N.M., Ariz., P.R. etc.)
   _____at home outside the U.S. (e.g. in Mexico, Venezuela, etc.)
   _____through language study in high school
   _____through college/university study
   _____through TEA (Region 10) language institute clusters
   _____other:

10. _____I am receiving Title VII funding for this program.
    _____I am paying my own fees or receiving other than Title VII funding.

EAST TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY - BILINGUAL TRAINING PROGRAM
INSTRUCTIONAL EVALUATION PROGRAM--FORM C (COURSE EVALUATION)

Social Security No._____ For_____ Semester of 19____
Please complete one form for each course.

Course Dept. _____ Number_____ Section_____

	1 very strong	2 strong	3 fair	4 weak	5 very weak
1. How would you rate the coverage of the subject matter?	1	2	3	4	5
2. How would you rate the methods in teaching the course?	1	2	3	4	5
3. How closely were the tests related to the materials covered?	1	2	3	4	5
4. In so far as you can tell at this point, how would you rate the grading system used in this course?	1	2	3	4	5
5. How would you rate your learning in this course ?	1	2	3	4	5
6. Taking all factors into consideration, what would your rating be for this course ?	1	2	3	4	5

	1 none to 20%	2 20% to 40%	3 40% to 60%	4 60% to 80%	5 80% to 100%
7. What percent of the time (estimate) did...					
a. the professor use Spanish in the course ?	1	2	3	4	5
b. the students use Spanish in the course?	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX C

Boletín Example

Programas Bilingües

Boletín

East Texas State University

Universidad Estatal del Este de Texas

23 October 1981 Volume VII, Nº1

CONGRESS SETS $139 MILLION CEILING FOR TITLE VII BILINGUAL EDUCATION FOR FY '82, '83, '84

A joint House-Senate conference committee that was formed to work out differences in the massive budget reconciliation package before Congress recommended an authorization ceiling of $139 million for bilingual education programs presently operating under Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The ceiling, approved by the full Congress and the President, will be the maximum amount that may be appropriated for Title VII programs each year from fiscal year 1982 to fiscal year 1984. Congress may, however, appropriate lesser amounts each year. The figure agreed to was more than the House-recommended $85.3 million but less than the Senate recommendation of $163 million for the same three years. Members of the conference committee which considered Title VII bilingual education were: Sen. Orrin G. Hatch (R-Utah), Sen. Dan Quayle (R-Ind.), Sen. Robert T. Stafford (R-Vt.), Sen. Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.), Sen. Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.), and Rep. Carl Perkins (D-Ky.).

ETSU; SUMMARY OF BILINGUAL STUDENTS ENROLLED & FUND DISTRIBUTION FROM TITLE VII GRANT FALL SEMESTER

Commencing its sixth year of funding under ESEA Title VII Bilingual Education, enrollment of students for Fall Semester 81 was a total of 84 with the following breakdown. Undergraduate level enrollment was 35, of which, 33 were funded for tuition and fees. The Graduate level enrollment was 40, of which, only 25 were funded for tuition and fees. The Post-master level enrollment was 9, of which, 3 were funded for tuition and fees.

Unfunded applicants that did enroll for Fall semester in graduate level and post-master level were 15 and 6, respectively.

Funds from Title VII Bilingual Education Grant were allocated for the amounts indicated as follow: Undergraduate level;total...$17,729.86, Graduate level; total ...$4,091.62, and Post-master level; total...$364.79. Total expenditures for tuition and fees, transportation, housing and books (for all levels) was $10,135.25, $2,602.80, $6,930.00, and $2,518.22, respectively.

THE STATUS OF EDUCATION FOR HISPANICS

By Ramón Santiago and Rosa Castro Feinberg

Educational and economic indicators do not paint an optimistic picture of the conditions of Hispanics in the United States. Three years ago, one-fifth of all Hispanic families had incomes below the poverty level, as compared with 9 percent of non-Hispanic families. In 1976, Hispanics aged 14-19 were twice as likely as whites not to complete high school, and at the elementary level about two-thirds were attending schools composed primarily of minority students. Of those who entered college in 1972, over half did not graduate.

In this article we will identify areas of progress and unresolved problems in achieving educational equity for Hispanic students. The information summarized here is based on two sources: the Executive Reports from three of the five Regional Conferences on the Education of Hispanics held in 1980 under the auspices of the Office of Hispanic Concerns and other Department of Education agencies, and presentations delivered at the Conference for the Midwest Region, where all Hispanic subgroups were represented. Each section concludes with a review of recommendations from the Regional Conferences. Unless otherwise noted, statistical data are from the National Center for Educational Statistics (Brown and others, 1980).

Ramón L. Santiago is Director of the Georgetown University Bilingual Education Service Center, Washington, D.C.; and Rosa Castro Feinberg is Associate Director of the University of Miami National Origin Desegregation Assistance Center, Coral Gables, Florida.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Over 3 million Hispanic children, or 6 percent of the total mainland public school population, are enrolled in elementary and secondary schools. Roughly a third of these children attend schools in which minority students comprise 90 to 100 percent of the total enrollment, and another third attend schools where the percentage of minority students is between 50-89 percent. Such segregation of Hispanic students is more marked in the Northeast but is increasing rapidly in the Midwest as well.

Enrollment figures reveal that 57 percent of the three- to six-year-old Hispanic children are in school, compared with 65 percent of whites. Among 8- to 13-year-olds, approximately 10 percent of Hispanic children are below grade level-double the rate for white, non-Hispanic children. This same ratio persists among the 14- to 20-year-olds, 25 percent of whom are not at the expected grade levels. In this older age group increased disadvantage is noted for the four out of five who live in households where Spanish is spoken.

In assessments conducted by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), 9-, 13-, and 17-year-old Hispanic students were significantly below the national average in social studies, science, mathematics, career and occupational development, and reading. Moreover, as they got older their achievement in math, science, and social studies decreased, though recent studies have noted a small but statistically significant improvement by 17-year-olds in science.

The National Center for Educational Statistics concluded, in a national longitudinal study of high school seniors begun in 1972, that Hispanic seniors generally receive lower grades than their white classmates, and that Hispanics participate less in extracurricular activities (with the exception of vocational clubs).

For Hispanics, the dropout rate has historically and consistently been higher than for non-Hispanics. In 1972, 16 percent of Hispanics aged 14 through 19 were out of school though not graduated, compared with 8 percent of the corresponding white group. By 1978, the figures had increased to 19 percent for Hispanics and 9 percent for whites.